DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 208 775 HE 014 510

AUTHOR Fenske, Robert H.; Boyd, Joseph D.
TITLE State Need-Based College Scholarship and Grant Programs: A Study of Their Development, 1969-1980. College Board Report No. 81-7.
INSTITUTION College Entrance Examination Board, New York, N.Y.
PUB DATE 81
NOTE 56p.
AVAILABLE FROM College Board Publication Orders, Box 2815, Princeton, NJ 08541 ($4.00).

EDRS PRICE MF01 Plus Postage. PC Not Available from EDRS.
DESCRIPTORS Access to Education; *College Students; Comparative Analysis; Federal Programs; Grants; Higher Education; *Need Analysis (Student Financial Aid); Scholarships; *State Aid; *State Federal Aid; State Surveys; *Student Financial Aid; Trend Analysis

ABSTRACT

Trends in state comprehensive programs of gift (nonrepayable) from 1969-70 through 1979-80 and the relationship of state student aid with funding for institutional operations and with federal programs were studied. The relatively small number of scholarships and grants were included with the need-based grants in the analysis. The first stage of program growth and development is identified as the period from 1969-70 through 1973-74, when many states perceived the need to provide, through their own resources, for the primary goals of wide access to higher education and reasonable choice of institutions. The number of states with programs increased from 19 to 28 during this period. The federal State Scholarships Incentive Grant program enacted in 1972 promoted state-federal aid for undergraduate students, and by 1980 all states were directly involved in student aid. A marked imbalance has been demonstrated in the level of funding and the number of awards provided among the states. In all but one of the 11 years analyzed, the five largest states in terms of dollars awarded were, in order, New York, Pennsylvania, Illinois, California, and New Jersey. The variables of number of years in operations, size of program, and the state's index of effort were used to define three groups of states, which were termed "established," "evolving," and "emerging." With additional federal programs, the percentage of all taxpayer gift aid need-based dollars appropriated by the state has dropped since 1974-75. In 1979-80, states provided an estimated 23.3 percent compared to the 96.7 percent provided by the federal government. Data by states are appended. (SW)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED208775

HE

College Board
Report
No. 81-7

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION
CENTER (ERIC)
☐ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.
☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.
• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official NIE position or policy.

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL IN MICROFICHE ONLY HAS BEEN GRANTED BY
CEEB
TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

State Need-Based College Scholarship and Grant Programs: A Study of Their Development, 1969-1980

Robert H. Fenske
Joseph D. Boyd

State Need-Based College Scholarship and Grant Programs: A Study of Their Development, 1969-1980

Robert H. Fenske

Joseph D. Boyd

College Board Report No. 81-7

College Entrance Examination Board, New York, 1981

Robert H. Fenske is Professor of Higher Education at Arizona State University, Tempe, Arizona. Dr. Joseph D. Boyd is Consultant on Higher Education, Illinois State Scholarship Commission.

Researchers are encouraged to express freely their professional judgment. Therefore, points of view or opinions stated in College Board Reports do not necessarily represent official College Board position or policy.

The College Board is a nonprofit membership organization that provides tests and other educational services for students, schools, and colleges. The membership is composed of more than 2,500 colleges, schools, school systems, and education associations. Representatives of the members serve on the Board of Trustees and advisory councils and committees that consider the programs of the College Board and participate in the determination of its policies and activities.

Additional copies of this report may be obtained from College Board Publication Orders, Box 2815, Princeton, New Jersey 08541. The price is $4.

Copyright © 1981 by College Entrance Examination Board.
All rights reserved.
Printed in the United States of America.

CONTENTS

List of Tables iii

Background 1

The State Role in the Federal/State/Institutional Partnership 2

The Context of State Student Aid Development in the 1970s 2

Program Growth and Development 4

Growth of Programs 5

A Typology of States with Student Aid Programs 8

Relationship of State Student Aid with Funding for Institutional Operations and with Federal Programs 19

State Student Grant Funds in Relation to State Funds for Higher Education Operation Budgets. 19

State Student Grant Funds in Relation to Selected Federal Student Aid Programs 20

The Role of State Student Incentive Grants in the States 23

Trends Requiring Aid Applicants to Demonstrate High Academic Potential in Addition to Need 24

State Student Aid Funds Available for Private and/or Public Colleges . . . 26

Overview and Summary 28

A Forecast of State Student Aid in the 1980s 30

Relationship Between State and Federal Student Aid 31

Technical Notes 33

References 34

Appendix 37

TABLES

1 Year in Which States and Territories Established Student Aid Programs 5

2 Growth in State-Funded Student Aid Programs, Number of Recipients and Funds Awarded 6

3 Distribution of Number of Awards and Dollars Awarded by Largest State Programs 7

4 Number of Awards, Dollars, and Rank Order of Size of State Program, 1969-70 . 9

5 Number of Awards, Dollars, and Rank Order of Size of State Program, 1975-76 . 9

6 Number of Awards, Dollars, and Rank Order of Size of State Program, 1979-80 . 10

7 Rank Order of States in Total Number of Awards in Undergraduate Need-Based Aid Programs, 1969-70 through 1979-80 13

8 Rank Order of States in Total Dollars Awarded in Undergraduate Need-Based Aid Programs, 1969-70 through 1979-80 14

9 Rank Order of Undergraduate Need-Based State Scholarship/Grant Mean Award Values, 1979-80 15

10 Rank Order of Indexes of Effort: State Student Aid Dollars Awarded per Total State Population, 1979-80 16

11 State Student Financial Aid Agencies by Size (Funds Appropriated), Age (Number of Years Established), and Index of Effort (Funds Appropriated per Capita) in 1979-80 18

12 Total State Appropriations for Student Grants and Higher Education Operating Funds, 1969-70 through 1979-80 19

13 Mean Value (Percentage) of Established, Evolving, and Emerging State Scholarship/Grant Dollars to All Dollars for Operations in Higher Education . 21

14 Need-Based State and Federal Undergraduate Grant Dollars 1969-70 through 1979-80 22

15 Percentage of U.S. Total Federal Program Dollars for Established, Evolving, and Emerging States 23

16 Percentages of SSIG Federal Dollars to All State-Administered Undergraduate Need-Based Scholarship/Grant Dollars, 1979-80 24

17 Shift from Competitively Based State Grant Programs to Need-Based Only Programs in Established, Evolving, and Emerging States, 1969-70, and 1975-76 through 1979-80 26

18 Distribution to Public-Private Colleges of State Grant Awards and Dollars in 1969-70, and 1975-76 through 1979-80 27

19 Established, Evolving, and Emerging States Distribution of Awards/Dollars by Public/Private Sector, 1975-76 through 1979-80 27

Appendix

A Number of Awards and Dollars Appropriated by States, 1969-70 through 1980-81, as Reported in Each Annual NASSGP Survey 38

B Comparison of State Expenditures for Total State Higher Education Operations and Student Financial Aid, 1969-70 through 1980-81 42

C Index of Effort: State Student Aid Award Dollars per State Population, 1970-71 through 1979-80 48

BACKGROUND

State-funded programs for need-based undergraduate student financial aid are a potent and relatively new force in financing higher education.

Historically, the efforts of colleges and universities themselves were dominant in student financial aid, before the federal government entered the picture and before more than a few states funded large-scale programs. The institutions raised scholarship and grant funds from external private sources or from internal sources such as tuition. During the late 1950s, direct state funding for student aid emerged from modest and almost dormant roots, which had existed since the mid-nineteenth century. State student aid grew rapidly in the 1960s and early 1970s and, in many states, began partially to displace the traditional institutional aid programs. In the decade of the '70s, the federal government became the dominant force in student aid. Part of the federal thrust involved germination of new state programs through the State Student Incentive Grant (SSIG) program initiated in 1974. The desired effect was achieved. The number of states with student aid programs nearly doubled in the next few years.

At the beginning of the 1980s a partnership exists between federal and state governments, the institutions, and a variety of private sources, such as foundations. The state sector is an integral part of the total student financial aid picture. Yet, the story of its dynamic growth, development, and present role has not been told in detail and in relation to other student aid efforts. This study seeks to do so. We describe the growth and development of state scholarship and grant programs largely in quantitative terms (e.g., funds awarded, numbers and characteristics of students, and types of institutions served). We also develop and apply interpretive indexes of growth and level of effort that allow comparisons between the states. Interpretation is aided by a typology of states called emerging, evolving, and established in terms of student aid.

Both the state and federal roles in student aid are so new and so dominant that it is difficult to gain a balanced perspective. The concept of tax-supported entitlement grants for practically anyone of any academic ability level to attend nearly any type of postsecondary school is so *sui generis* in this or any other society it may be well to consider that most adults are probably unaware of this new use of their tax money. Most parents of present college-age youth were inbued with the traditional American idea of family sacrifice for a college education. The new entitlement concept is not yet embedded in the social and economic patterns of the country. Thus, its permanency is not yet established.

If one were to cast the historical panorama of student aid in the metaphor of a single 24-hour day representing the 345 years of American higher education, the institutional role occupies the picture alone from the beginning of the day at midnight through the early morning hours, the forenoon, the afternoon, and the early evening. At about 7:30 in the evening, state programs enter the picture as New York begins the first large-scale comprehensive program. State efforts begin to grow more significant late in the evening as California and Illinois establish programs. The federal government enters the picture hardly an hour before the end of the hypothetical day as the Higher Education Act of 1965 is passed, and, just 35 minutes before midnight the Basic Education Opportunity Grant (BEOG) program is funded. Yet, as midnight strikes to signal the end of the hypothetical day, the proportions among the federal, state, and institutional sectors are most unequal. According to a recent Carnegie Council on Policy Studies in Higher Education report (1979), "Student aid is now 90 percent from public sources, as compared with 65 percent ten years ago; it was nearly zero percent from public sources before World War II...." (p. 4). Of the current share from public sources, the states provide about 10 percent and the federal government provides 90 percent. In 1969-70, the base year for the present study, just under $200 million in state funds were awarded to 470,000 recipients in the 19 states that had aid programs; federal expenditures for the Educational Opportunity Grants (EOG) (the sole federal need-based program at that time) were 125 million dollars. By the 1979-80 award year, state expenditures had grown nearly fourfold to about 780 million dollars; however, federal expenditures for need-based grant aid had grown twentyfold.

The State Role in the Federal/State/Institutional Partnership

In 1975 "The National Task Force on Student Aid Problems enunciated a conceptual framework for the governance of the student aid process: A 'partnership' of Federal and State agencies, institutions, students, parents, and private agencies, working in concert to implement public policy concerning aid...." (Van Dusen, 1979, p. 25).

The rapid rise of the federal government to dominance in student aid during the 1970s alarmed many observers accustomed to local- (institutional) or state-controlled programs or both. In particular, aid administrators at the institutional level have been concerned about becoming mere fiduciary agents for federal programs (Fenske, 1981, see especially pp. 23-25). The problems seem to originate less with inequality of dollar input among the partners (on a national scale, there probably never was a prolonged period of time when the institutional/state/federal roles were equal) than with the uncoordinated and often conflicting nature of the many programs and the inconsistent and constantly changing regulations under which they operate.

Because of its preponderance as a funding source, the federal government now dominates student aid. However, fears that the state and institutional sectors would diminish to the point of insignificance seem unfounded. Consider that state financial aid agencies now dispense over 900 million dollars annually in state appropriations, and that they have grown in number from around a dozen in the mid-1960s to include every state today. Creation of most, if not all, of 20 of the newest state programs is attributable to SSIG and other federal initiatives. "Consider also that institutional campuses are the interface between the funded programs and the object of the funds; institutional administrators mediate the awarding of state and federal funds to students. What is the alternative to the present partnership? Can one seriously envision hordes of federal officials housed on or near every campus directly dispensing federal largesse to students, bypassing state agencies and effectively displacing the traditional financial aid community? To fund implies, and indeed requires, stewardship (auditing and regulation), but it does not necessarily require administration of the entire process. The federal/state/institutional partnership will continue and the states will continue to play a vital role." (Fenske, 1981, p. 15).

The Context of State Student Aid Development in the 1970s

The issues and problems affecting student aid during the 1970s included: (1) an intensified interest in the so-called "market model" of higher education in which students as consumers would be given the financial means to obtain access to their choice of postsecondary programs; (2) as a corollary to (1), increased competition to traditional higher education was generated by extending eligibility to receive student aid funds to proprietary schools; (3) the realization that future shrinkage of the college-age cohort meant that higher education was overbuilt in terms of facilities; (4) the private sector had diminished from parity with the public sector in 1950 to less than one-fourth of total enrollments, and the prospects were for even greater shrinkage; (5) both state and federal legislators were dissatisfied with institutional handling of student protests of the late 1960s; (6) the debate continued over societal versus individual benefits of higher education; the student aid analogy of this debate was entitlement grants versus loans/self-help; (7) types of students new to traditional higher education were attracted in droves, including women, racial and ethnic minorities, and those who ranked in the middle third and even lower half of academic ability; and (8) it was evident that there were great interstate and regional differences in state efforts to provide access and choice through student financial aid.

Access and choice are two principal themes in student aid that have become familiar through frequent and thorough discussion over the past 20 years as they unfolded first in hortatory statements, then in large and growing funded student aid programs. The expressed goal of such programs has been to benefit young persons in the society by providing wide access to their choice of postsecondary education institutions.

Two principal strategies to increase access were carried out simultaneously over the past 25 years: (1) proliferation of many public low-cost commuter institutions, particularly community colleges, and (2) development of a wide variety of student financial assistance programs, including loans, student employment, and grants. Both strategies were pursued vigorously in the 1960s. The goal of wider access was achieved by changing the nature and purpose of monetary awards from prizes recognizing accomplishments or potential, to assistance granted almost solely to offset financial need. That is, emphasis shifted from scholarships to grants. This shift became even more pronounced through the 1970s both in state programs (as our data will show in the following chapters) and at the federal level by the massive Basic Educational Opportunity Grant (BEOG) Program.

The BEOG program (now called Pell Grants) was only one aspect of the 1972 Amendments to the student aid titles of the Higher Education Act of 1965 that affected state programs significantly. The State Student Incentive Grant (SSIG) program was aimed directly at the states. The Supplementary Educational Opportunity Grant (SEOG) program, the College Work-Study (CWS) program, and the loan programs all had their impact. In 1978, the Middle Income Student Assistance Act further muddied the waters. In 1974 Mathews observed that "...there is no clear-cut proposal from any side addressed to the proper roles for the burgeoning state programs vis-a-vis the federal effort. A firm state viewpoint has not registered yet on either side of the Capitol...." (p. 26). This observation seems equally true some seven years later.

By 1969-70 the 19 states that had established and were operating agencies to administer state student aid funds exhibited great differences in size, scope, and types of program.

Many states not only moved to ensure further student access by scholarships and grants, but to preserve choice by allowing such student aid to be used by private colleges as well as by public ones. The key was to reduce the tuition gap between public and private institutions by relating monetary awards not only to the financial needs and resources of the prospective student and his or her family, but also to the cost of the institution chosen by the aid applicant.

This study is limited to the predominant type of state student aid program, namely, nonrepayable or "gift" financial aid to postsecondary students that has been appropriated by state governments for this specific purpose. Included are both scholarships and grants. Although there is no consensus on the precise definitions of either of these terms, scholarships are generally awarded in recognition of higher academic or other achievements and potential. Scholarships may or may not include financial need as a criterion. Grants are generally awarded solely on the basis of need to students who are admissible to designated postsecondary institutions. Because grants have come to constitute about 80 percent of aggregate state student gift aid expenditures, the term grants will be used for brevity and convenience in the remainder of this study to include all nonrepayable aid, including scholarships, except where specifically noted. This study does not include specific analysis of other state student financial assistance efforts, such as low tuition, loans, tuition waivers or remission, and employment offered as part of an aid program by the state or institution.

Beginning with the 1969-70 academic year, the state student financial aid agencies have provided data annually to the National Association of State Scholarship/Grant Programs (NASSGP). These data pertain to the various programs funded by the states and were edited by Joseph D. Boyd and compiled into annual reports during the 11 year period beginning in 1969-70 and ending with the 1979-80 academic year. These 11 annual reports are the data base on undergraduate nonrepayable grant aid this study focuses on. Data reported in a twelfth (1980-81) NASSGP annual report were also available, but are included herein only as extensions of basic data for 1969-80 shown in the Appendix. The 1980-81 data set is not included for analysis and discussion in the body of this study because (1) our focus is entirely on the decade 1969-70 through 1979-80, during which state student aid experienced the greatest growth, and (2) under new editorship the twelfth annual report used a different reporting format, which impeded the direct comparability of the data to the

previous 11 reports. Inspection of the 1980-81 data in the Appendix shows that the general trends we note during the late '70s continued through the first full academic year of the new decade of the '80s.

The NASSGP survey data have been used in an extremely wide and varied range of publications. See, for example, Breneman and Finn (1978), Carnegie Council on Policy Studies in Higher Education (1977, 1979), Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching (1976), ECS/NCHEMS/SHEEO (1979), Hansen (1979), Keene, Adams and King (1975), McCoy (1976, 1979), National Commission on the Financing of Postsecondary Education (1973), and Smith (1978), among others. In addition, The Chronicle of Higher Education has several times published annual summaries of these data. Despite the primacy and frequent use of these data, no one, to the best of our knowledge, has thoroughly analyzed the NASSGP data over the entire 11 year period. Typically, data from only one academic year are compared with data concerning other financial aspects of higher education. Consequently, the present study represents the first analysis of trends in state-funded grant aid over the 11 years spanning the decade of the '70s.

These data are subject to all of the limitations of self-reported information. However, because the reports were made or approved by the agency executive directors for compilation by their own professional association, it is assumed that the data are sufficiently accurate to delineate trends and to make generalizations. At any rate, no other comparable data base exists on state student aid. With negligible exceptions as noted later, all states with state-funded student aid programs reported data during the 11 years encompassed in this study.

PROGRAM GROWTH AND DEVELOPMENT

In 1969-70, the base year for this study, 19 states had programs to which state-appropriated funds were allocated for direct gift (nonrepayable) financial aid to students. From this base of well-established state programs at the turn of the decade, the number of states directly involved in student aid increased in two distinguishable stages to include every state by 1980.

The first stage can be identified as the period from 1969-70 through 1973-74, when many states perceived the need to provide, through their own resources, for the primary goals of wide access to higher education and the maintenance of a reasonable choice of institution for the students who are provided access. The number of states with programs increased from 19 to 28 during this period.[1]

The second stage of growth was in reponse to the federal SSIG program contained in the 1972 Amendments to Title IV of the Higher Education Act of 1965. This initiative recognized the desirability of state involvement in student financial aid and sought to increase participation by establishing "...a state-federal partnership in which the federal government provides dollar-for-dollar matching to states for their expenditures on grants to undergraduate students in postsecondary education...." (Hansen, 1979, p. 6). By the 1978-79 funding year, 50 state agencies (not including the District of Columbia) reported involvement in the SSIG program.

This two-staged pattern of growth from the original base of 19 states, provides the rationale for special analysis later. First, however, we present the basic data that describe the growth and development of state grant programs.

---

1. Data on year of establishment of certain state programs are inconsistent. See Technical Note 1.

Growth of Programs

In the first NASSGP annual report, Boyd (1969) tabulated the years in which each of the first 19 states established a program. The earliest of these was Maryland, which is estimated to have established a program in 1825. Then, a hiatus of nearly 90 years elapsed, until New York established its first student aid program in 1913. Twenty-two years later, Oregon established its program in 1935. A considerable period of time again passed until a cluster of programs were established in the late 1950s in response to an awareness of the impending enrollment increases. California (1956), Illinois (1958), Massachusetts (1958), and New Jersey (1959) were all established before the 1960s.

As shown in Table 1, the early 1970s saw a modest continuing growth with two new programs in 1970-71, three in the following year, and four more in 1972-73. State programs initiated during these years relate primarily to efforts to follow the lead of the original

TABLE 1. Year in Which States and Territories Established Student Aid Programs

Year	Cumulative Total	State/Territory
Before or During 1969-70	19	California, Connecticut, Illinois, Indiana, Iowa, Kansas, Maine, Maryland, Massachusetts, Michigan, Minnesota, New Jersey, New York, Oregon, Pennsylvania, Rhode Island, Vermont, West Virginia, Wisconsin
1970-71	21	Florida, Ohio
1971-72	24	Oklahoma, Tennessee, Washington*
1972-73	28	Kentucky, Missouri, Nebraska, South Carolina
1973-74	28	None
1974-75	39	Colorado, Delaware,* Georgia, Idaho, North Dakota, Puerto Rico, South Dakota, Texas, Trust Territory, Virgin Islands, Virginia
1975-76	46	Arkansas, Hawaii, Louisiana, Montana, North Carolina, Utah, Guam
1976-77	53	Alabama, American Samoa, District of Columbia, Mississippi, New Hampshire, New Mexico, Wyoming
1977-78	56	Alaska, Arizona, Nevada
1978-79	57	Northern Marianas
1979-80	57	None

*These two states did not respond to the NASSGP surveys until the years indicated. Both evidently had programs of undetermined type and size for some years before responding. See Technical Note 1.

TABLE 2. Growth in State-Funded Student Aid Programs, Number of Recipients and Funds Awarded

Year	Number of Recipients	Funds Awarded (millions)
1969-70	470,000	$199.9
1970-71	535,200 + 13.9%	236.3 + 18.2%
1971-72	604,000 + 12.9%	268.3 + 13.6%
1972-73	661,700 + 9.6%	315.5 + 17.5%
1973-74	733,300 + 10.8%	364.2 + 15.4%
1974-75	813,100 + 10.9%	440.8 + 21.0%
1975-76	901,900 + 10.9%	510.2 + 15.7%
1976-77	1,104,400 + 22.5%	651.4 + 27.7%
1977-78	1,161,400 + 5.2%	737.0 + 13.1%
1978-79	1,217,750 + 4.9%	789.2 + 7.1%
1979-80	1,262,350 + 3.7%	852.3 + 8.0%

Source: Recipient and funds awarded data are from the annual NASSGP Surveys. Funds awarded include SSIG appropriated to states.

19 states in using the states' own resources to meet the needs of their citizens for access to higher education and choice of institution.

During the 1973-74 year, no additional state programs were established, perhaps because the widely publicized discussions of the Higher Education Amendments of 1972 focused on the impending thrust toward a national entitlement grant program. There was considerable uncertainty about whether or not the states' need to provide student financial aid would simply be supplanted by the proposed large-scale federal grant programs. The first funding year of the SSIG (1974-75) witnessed the desired effect of the federal incentive: eight states and three territories established new programs. This spurt of growth was continued in 1975-76 with six states and another territory establishing programs, and in the following year with five states, one territory, and the District of Columbia initiating programs. The final two years of growth comprised the final three states of Alaska, Arizona, and Nevada, starting programs in 1977-78, and the trust territory of Northern Marianas beginning its program in 1978-79. Thus, by 1979-80 every state and territory, as well as the federal District of Columbia, had established a program.

As will be shown later, many of the original 19 states had established large programs which continue to be extremely large in comparison with most of the newer programs, especially those added in response to the SSIG during the last half of the 1970s. Table 2 shows the cumulative growth in number of recipients and funds awarded.

During the 11 year period, the number of monetary award recipients grew by a factor of 2.69; the total amount of funds awarded increased by a factor of 4.26. The relatively larger growth in funds awarded reflects, not only the impact of inflation and higher college costs per student, but also the movement during this period toward funneling many of these

TABLE 3. Distribution of Number of Awards and Dollars Awarded by Largest State Programs

Year	Cumulative Total of 5 Largest States		Cumulative Total of 10 Largest States		Cumulative Total of 20 Largest States	
	% of Awards	% of $	% of Awards	% of $	% of Awards	% of $
1969-70	87.37	84.81	96.92	95.61	*100.00	*100.00
1970-71	86.32	80.34	96.35	93.88	99.04	99.04
1971-72	81.53	75.76	94.28	92.83	99.82	99.84
1972-73	79.79	75.65	92.62	91.48	98.89	88.90
1973-74	75.56	52.80	90.12	70.44	97.98	98.08
1974-75	70.60	68.62	85.56	84.54	96.06	96.39
1975-76	68.95	65.30	84.07	82.73	95.21	95.92
1976-77	68.02	66.27	83.36	83.08	93.82	95.08
1977-78	65.00	65.22	80.18	81.31	92.17	93.88
1978-79	62.16	65.65	76.91	80.82	90.33	93.07
1979-80	60.34	64.72	75.87	79.64	89.52	92.40

*Total of 19 states.

dollars to students in private colleges with markedly higher costs than public colleges. Nelson (1978) reported that "...the average state grant awarded a student attending a private institution $780 in 1975-76, exceeds the average given to his or her counterparts in the public sector $457...." (p. 89). The distribution of fund allocations to the public and private sector will be analyzed later.

Through the '70s the size distribution of the state programs was markedly skewed toward a few extremely large state programs. Table 3 shows the impact on this distribution of the five largest, ten largest, and twenty largest states over the 11 year period.

Of the 19 state programs in existence by 1969-70, the five largest states comprised 87.37 percent of the total awards and 84.81 percent of the dollars awarded by all state programs. These states were, in order of program size, New York, Pennsylvania, Illinois, Michigan, and California. Generally these same states predominated through the 11 year period. During the following two years (1970-71 and 1971-72) the five largest states were, in order of size, New York, Pennsylvania, Illinois, New Jersey, and California. During the next five years (1972-73 through 1976-77), the rank order of the five largest states was New York, Pennsylvania, Illinois, California, and New Jersey. In 1977-78 New York again led in total dollars awarded, followed by California, Illinois, Pennsylvania, and Ohio. In 1978-79, the top five states were New York, Illinois, California, Pennsylvania, and New Jersey; and in the final year of this study (1979-80) the rank order of the five largest states was New York, California, Pennsylvania, Illinois, and New Jersey. It is noteworthy that of the total of 11 years during which the NASSGP data are available, the five largest states in 10 of the years are New York, Pennsylvania, Illinois, California,

and New Jersey. In 1977-78, New Jersey moved temporarily down to sixth place when it was replaced by Ohio in fifth place. Table 3 also shows that even when the original number of 19 in 1969-70 expanded to a total of 57 states and territories in 1979-80, the five largest states still constituted nearly two-thirds of the total. In 1979-80, less than half the states (20) made up 89.52 percent of total awards and 92.40 percent of all the dollars awarded. Obviously, all of the remaining 37 states and territories (most of whom's programs are relatively new) have small programs.

Tables 1, 2, and 3 are summary tables drawn from the 11 annual NASSGP reports. Table A in the Appendix shows the number of total awards and total dollars awarded in each state and territory with at least one need-based program for each of the 11 years of the period under study. All of the data presented in Tables 1 through 11 can be substantiated from that basic table.

Tables 1, 2, and 3 also give indications of the two stages of growth mentioned earlier. To further analyze these stages, numerical and percentage distributions of awards, dollars, and rank order of all states with programs in 1969-70, 1975-76, and 1979-80 are given in Tables 4, 5, and 6, respectively. The base year is included to gauge the extent of growth by 1975-76, the first full year in which the states had adequate opportunity to establish programs after the SSIG was funded in 1974. Generally, such establishment involved a lead time of one or two years for appropriate state legislation to be drafted, debated, and signed into law, and for each newly authorized agency to become operational.

The data shown in Tables 4, 5, and 6 clearly show the completion of a trend toward total participation by states and territories. But the extent and phasing of participation is most interesting and invites analysis on a number of bases as discussed in the following section.

A Typology of States with Student Aid Programs

The basic data on establishment and growth of state aid suggest that a number of characteristics are especially important to study comparative program development among the states. Accordingly, we analyzed the joint effect of three characteristics selected after careful consideration and found that a typology of state student aid development resulted. The typology is used in turn to analyze further the role of state student aid in relation to other sources of financing higher education.

Detailed analysis of the basic data, presented in the preceding section, indicates that the three factors that could provide especially important insights are (1) the length of time that the program was established (we shall refer to this as the age of the program), (2) the size of the program in terms of number of awards and dollars awarded, and (3) an index of funding effort made by each state in student aid relative to population size. For brevity, these factors are referred to as age, size, and effort.

The rationales for selecting each of these characteristics are as follows:

Age of the program indicates to some degree the motivation of the state in student aid. Many of the 19 states, which had established programs by the 1969-70 base year for this study, did so long before the enrollment boom of the 1960s. They perceived student aid as an important means to insure access and choice as a permanent part of their state policy toward higher education. Other states in this early group established programs in more specific response to social pressures for insuring access by disadvantaged youth during a period of crowded public campuses and spiraling tuition costs in the private sector. The second group of states, those which established programs during the period from 1970 through 1974, did so before the incentives existed in the 1972 Education Amendments in the SSIG program. They followed the lead of the original group of states in making a commitment to achieve such goals as access and choice of institution by directly providing state resources and programs. These newer programs were of moderate size and at an intermediate stage of development by 1980.

TABLE 4. Number of Awards, Dollars, and Rank Order of Size of State Program 1969–70

State	Number of Awards		Rank Order	Total Dollars Awarded		Rank Order
	N	%		$	%	
California	14,683	3.12	6	11,865,143	5.93	5
Connecticut	1,519	0.32	15	906,675	0.45	14
Illinois	38,270	8.13	3	26,058,608	13.03	3
Indiana	6,550	1.39	10	3,080,000	1.54	7
Iowa	2,705	0.58	12	1,762,500	0.88	11
Kansas	409	0.09	19	150,000	0.07	19
Maryland	7,250	1.54	8	2,900,000	1.45	9
Massachusetts	3,000	0.64	11	2,000,000	1.00	10
Michigan	24,030	5.10	5	12,500,000	6.25	4
Minnesota	1,293	0.27	16	775,000	0.39	16
New Jersey	26,658	5.67	4	11,850,000	5.93	6
New York	245,038	52.04	1	67,745,320	33.89	1
Oregon	6,961	1.48	9	815,400	0.41	15
Pennsylvania	77,400	16.44	2	51,400,000	25.71	2
Rhode Island	2,000	0.42	14	1,500,000	0.76	12
Vermont	2,100	0.44	13	1,099,255	0.55	13
Washington	838	0.18	17	390,000	0.19	17
West Virginia	625	0.13	18	175,000	0.09	18
Wisconsin	9,510	2.02	7	2,950,000	1.48	8
Total	470,839	100%		$199,933,901	100%	

TABLE 5. Number of Awards, Dollars, and Rank Order of Size of State Program 1975–76

State	Number of Awards		Rank Order	Total Dollars Awarded		Rank Order
	N	%		$	%	
Arkansas	1,550	0.18	30	461,000	0.09	33
California	50,616	5.83	4	51,073,000	10.22	4
Colorado	13,000	1.50	13	7,842,000	1.57	14
Connecticut	8,126	0.94	16	5,641,000	1.13	16
Delaware	265	0.03	41	152,000	0.03	41
Florida	3,950	0.45	25	4,599,000	0.92	17
Georgia	4,000	0.46	24	1,192,000	0.24	28
Hawaii	390	0.04	40	176,000	0.04	40
Idaho	130	0.01	42	102,000	0.02	43
Illinois	92,300	10.63	3	64,800,000	12.96	3
Indiana	23,525	2.71	9	15,955,000	3.19	9
Iowa	8,599	0.99	15	9,635,000	1.93	12
Kansas	4,250	0.49	23	3,425,000	0.69	19
Kentucky	5,170	0.60	20	1,736,000	0.35	25
Louisiana	1,200	0.14	32	559,000	0.11	31
Maine	706	0.07	36	569,000	0.11	30
Maryland	2,300	0.26	28	1,374,000	0.27	26
Massachusetts	19,030	2.19	10	11,374,000	2.28	11
Michigan	26,352	3.03	7	21,082,000	4.22	6
Minnesota	14,558	1.68	12	13,500,000	2.70	10
Mississippi	600	0.07	37	300,000	0.06	35
Missouri	8,000	0.92	17	3,783,000	0.76	18

TABLE 5. Number of Awards, Dollars, and Rank Order of Size of State Program 1975–76 (continued)

State	Number of Awards		Rank Order	Total Dollars Awarded		Rank Order
	N	%		$	%	
Montana	400	0.05	39	115,000	0.02	42
Nebraska	800	0.09	35	280,000	0.06	37
New Jersey	38,537	4.44	6	26,074,000	5.22	5
New York	281,800	32.45	1	114,500,000	22.91	1
North Carolina	1,400	0.16	31	845,000	0.17	29
North Dakota	830	0.10	34	242,000	0.05	38
Ohio	50,000	5.76	5	20,447,000	4.09	7
Oklahoma	1,737	0.20	29	537,000	0.11	32
Oregon	7,195	0.83	18	2,914,000	0.58	21
Pennsylvania	124,000	14.28	2	69,921,000	13.99	2
Rhode Island	2,963	0.34	27	2,257,000	0.45	23
South Carolina	5,817	0.67	19	7,423,000	1.49	15
South Dakota	1,032	0.12	33	207,000	0.04	39
Texas	16,600	1.91	11	8,900,000	1.78	13
Utah	537	0.06	38	343,000	0.07	34
Vermont	4,564	0.53	22	2,728,000	0.55	22
Virginia	4,661	0.54	21	1,337,000	0.27	27
Washington	9,551	1.10	14	3,212,000	0.64	20
West Virginia	3,503	0.40	26	1,795,000	0.36	24
Wisconsin	23,855	2.75	8	16,160,000	3.23	8
Guam	65	0.01	43	298,000	0.06	36
Total	868,464	100%		$499,865,000	100%	

TABLE 6. Number of Awards, Dollars, and Rank Order of Size of State Program 1979–80

State	Number of Awards		Rank Order	Total Dollars Awarded		Rank Order
	N	%		$	%	
Alabama	8,225	0.65	26	2,468,000	0.29	31
Alaska	160	0.01	56	240,000	0.03	55
Arizona	2,650	0.21	36	1,800,000	0.21	33
Arkansas	4,000	0.32	33	1,104,000	0.13	38
California	65,375	5.18	6	83,478,000	9.79	2
Colorado	10,500	0.83	23	8,060,000	0.95	18
Connecticut	10,550	0.84	22	8,619,000	1.01	17
Delaware	1,600	0.13	42	550,000	0.06	43
District of Columbia	895	0.07	51	1,073,000	0.13	39
Florida	12,000	0.95	20	10,400,000	1.22	15
Georgia	13,500	1.07	16	3,365,000	0.39	28
Hawaii	2,700	0.21	35	452,000	0.05	50
Idaho	930	0.07	49	494,000	0.06	48
Illinois	76,296	6.04	3	74,497,000	8.74	4
Indiana	27,965	2.22	11	21,479,000	2.52	9
Iowa	13,385	1.06	17	15,302,000	1.80	13
Kansas	6,153	0.49	28	4,650,000	0.55	24
Kentucky	13,612	0.91	15	5,309,000	0.62	22
Louisiana	2,100	0.16	38	872,000	0.10	40
Maine	1,800	0.14	40	1,350,000	0.16	36
Maryland	12,300	0.97	19	5,554,000	0.65	21

TABLE 6. Number of Awards, Dollars, and Rank Order of Size of State Program 1979–80 (continued)

State	Number of Awards		Rank Order	Total Dollars Awarded		Rank Order
	N	%		$	%	
Massachusetts	26,597	2.11	12	16,249,000	1.91	12
Michigan	32,689	2.59	8	30,192,000	3.54	7
Minnesota	30,488	2.42	9	23,631,000	2.77	8
Mississippi	2,200	0.17	37	1,109,000	0.13	37
Missouri	28,060	2.22	10	9,000,000	1.06	16
Montana	1,373	0.10	46	412,000	0.05	52
Nebraska	1,700	0.13	41	856,000	0.10	41
Nevada	930	0.03	50	493,000	0.06	49
New Hampshire	1,250	0.10	47	517,000	0.06	45
New Jersey	68,207	5.40	4	37,979,000	4.46	5
New Mexico	1,500	0.12	43	720,000	0.08	42
New York	426,340	33.77	1	274,500,000	32.21	1
North Carolina	5,800	0.46	30	3,299,000	0.39	29
North Dakota	1,450	0.11	44	543,000	0.06	44
Ohio	66,000	5.23	5	30,916,000	3.63	6
Oklahoma	10,205	0.81	24	2,265,000	0.27	32
Oregon	12,614	1.00	18	5,707,000	0.67	20
Pennsylvania	125,000	9.90	2	81,100,000	9.52	3
Rhode Island	5,779	0.46	31	4,218,000	0.49	26
South Carolina	7,650	0.61	27	10,618,000	1.25	14
South Dakota	1,400	0.11	45	420,000	0.05	51
Tennessee	11,098	0.88	21	6,200,000	0.73	19
Texas	26,250	2.08	13	18,449,000	2.16	11
Utah	3,000	0.24	34	1,504,000	0.18	34
Vermont	6,150	0.49	29	4,253,000	0.50	25
Virginia	14,000	1.11	14	3,782,000	0.44	27
Washington	9,350	0.74	25	4,796,000	0.56	23
West Virginia	4,850	0.38	32	3,021,000	0.35	30
Wisconsin	39,400	3.12	7	20,967,000	2.46	10
Wyoming	500	0.04	52	251,000	0.03	54
American Samoa	180	0.01	55	300,000	0.04	53
Guam	60	0.01	57	235,000	0.03	56
Northern Marianas	360	0.03	53	500,000	0.06	47
Puerto Rico	1,940	0.15	39	1,458,000	0.17	35
Trust Territory	1,000	0.08	48	505,000	0.06	46
Virgin Islands	355	0.03	54	214,000	0.03	57
Total	1,262,361	100%		$852,295,000	100%	

Presumably, most of the newest states are responding to the matching dollar incentives set up in the SSIG program. They have chosen to begin student aid in a somewhat tentative fashion rather than at the outset expressing a large-scale and long-term commitment. This characterization does not fit all of the newest states by any means; however, it does fit most of them.

The importance of size of the program is self-evident. Tables 7 and 8 summarize the data on relative size of the states' programs.

The data summarized in Tables 7 and 8 dramatize the extreme range of involvement in student aid among the states. Clearly, there are some relationships between age and size of program that are quickly suggested by comparing Table 1 (age) with Tables 7 and 8 (size). In terms of number of awards, two states (New York and Pennsylvania) have made over 50 percent of all state-funded awards in the country over the past 11 years. The next four states (Illinois, New Jersey, California, and Ohio) add nearly another one-fourth (23.5 percent) of the total with the result that the largest six states awarded three-fourths of the total awarded by the 57 states and territories over the last decade.

Essentially the same situation holds in dollars awarded: The same six states hold the top six places (though in slightly different order) and in total constitute 73 percent of the total money awarded over the 11 year period. A review of Tables 4, 5, and 6 shows that the cumulative totals for the 11 years, as shown in Tables 7 and 8, were generally true for the sample years 1969-70, 1975-76, and 1979-80. The overall scale of these activities is impressive by any standard. The 11 year total of 9,457,250 state-funded awards does not represent that many different students because some of the students received continuation awards. Nonetheless, many millions of students have been assisted in their goals of access and choice in higher education. Similarly, the cumulative total of well over 5 billion dollars shown in Table 8 is a massive commitment conditioned, of course, by the fact that only six states account for three-fourths of both award and dollar totals.

A careful comparison between Tables 4 through 8 reveals that the rank orders of the states differ between number of awards and dollars awarded, and that these differences vary from year to year. That is, for each year, the average size of monetary award varies from state to state and within each state over time. The average size or mean award for each year can be derived from the basic data in Table A in the Appendix. For purposes of commentary here, we show Table 9 depicting the mean award value for all of the states and the District of Columbia in 1979-80.

Again, great variability is shown among the states. The two noncontiguous states of Alaska and Hawaii have the largest and smallest mean awards, respectively. Alaska's average award of $1,500 is almost exactly nine times the size of Hawaii's average of $167. There are a number of factors that account for interstate differences in average awards. Among the most important are the extent to which state student aid attempts to reduce the gap in cost between public and private institutions, and the amount of total cost that the award attempts to cover.

When one considers the vast differences in size of programs as depicted in Tables 7 and 8 and in the preceding chapter, it seems obvious that states such as New York, Pennsylvania, and Illinois, all of which have assumed a leadership role over the last 11 years with massive programs, cannot be combined with states such as Alaska, Arizona, and Nevada for analysis in any meaningful way.

For example, New York in 1980 had about 9 percent of all U.S. college enrollments, but provided these students with nearly one third of all grants available through states (Hauptman, 1980, p. 1). In contrast to New York's commitment to student aid, which began with state appropriations well before World War I, Arizona made its first appropriation ($150,000) for student aid in 1979-80. Arizona, Alaska, and Nevada all established their first programs in 1977-78, and all of their programs are small scale, somewhat tentative in nature, and clearly seem to be responses to the incentives of the SSIG program at the present time. This is not to say that any or all of them might not someday grow into massive

TABLE 7. Rank Order of States in Total Number of Awards in Undergraduate Need-Based Aid Programs, 1969-70 through 1979-80

Rank	State	# Awards	% of Total	Rank	State	# Awards	% of Total
1	New York	3,629,480	38.38	28	Kansas	35,152	.37
2	Pennsylvania	1,184,195	12.52	29	Rhode Island	34,115	.36
3	Illinois	813,141	8.60	30	West Virginia	32,190	.34
4	New Jersey	507,718	5.37	31	Alabama	22,443	.24
5	California	461,640	4.88	32	North Carolina	19,592	.21
6	Ohio	442,014	4.67	33	Arkansas	12,049	.13
7	Michigan	289,935	3.07	34	Hawaii	11,646	.12
8	Wisconsin	250,818	2.65	35	Utah	11,110	.12
9	Indiana	197,679	2.09	36	Nebraska	9,141	.10
10	Massachusetts	191,467	2.02	37	Maine	8,663	.09
11	Texas	157,958	1.67	38	Louisiana	8,223	.09
12	Minnesota	156,949	1.66	39	Mississippi	8,149	.09
13	Colorado	101,027	1.07	40	Arizona	8,080	.09
14	Missouri	100,543	1.06	41	South Dakota	6,922	.07
15	Iowa	89,387	.95	42	North Dakota	6,506	.07
16	Oregon	71,565	.76	43	Delaware	4,549	.05
17	Connecticut	66,676	.71	44	Montana	4,549	.05
18	Maryland	62,852	.66	45	New Mexico	4,372	.05
19	Washington	60,714	.64	46	New Hampshire	3,682	.04
20	Florida	52,248	.55	47	Idaho	3,139	.03
21	Kentucky	51,885	.55	48	District of Columbia	3,029	.03
22	Vermont	47,109	.50	49	Nevada	1,584	.02
23	South Carolina	45,668	.48	50	Wyoming	1,174	.01
24	Georgia	45,579	.48	51	Alaska	534	.01
25	Virginia	44,536	.47				
26	Oklahoma	37,087	.39				
27	Tennessee	36,787	.39	Total		9,457,250	100.00

ABLE 8. Rank Order of States in Total Dollars Awarded in Undergraduate Need-Based Aid Programs, 1969-70 through 1979-80

ank	State	Dollars	% of Total	Rank	State	Dollars	% of Total
1	New York	$1,559,989,000	29.14	28	Virginia	13,382,000	.25
2	Pennsylvania	716,269,000	13.38	29	Georgia	12,953,000	.24
3	Illinois	635,900,000	11.88	30	North Carolina	11,020,000	.21
4	California	503,655,000	9.41	31	Oklahoma	8,062,000	.15
5	New Jersey	271,094,000	5.06	32	Alabama	5,945,000	.11
6	Michigan	219,454,000	4.10	33	Utah	5,790,000	.11
7	Ohio	200,083,000	3.74	34	Arizona	5,366,000	.10
8	Wisconsin	139,633,000	2.61	35	Maine	4,649,000	.09
9	Indiana	138,251,000	2.58	36	Mississippi	4,288,000	.08
10	Minnesota	115,601,000	2.16	37	District of Columbia	3,563,000	.07
11	Massachusetts	114,167,000	2.13	38	Louisiana	3,131,000	.06
12	Iowa	86,543,000	1.62	39	Nebraska	2,964,000	.06
13	Texas	80,809,000	1.51	40	Arkansas	2,800,000	.05
14	Colorado	61,268,000	1.14	41	Delaware	2,675,000	.05
15	South Carolina	54,779,000	1.02	42	North Dakota	2,115,000	.04
16	Florida	50,008,000	.93	43	New Mexico	1,999,000	.04
17	Connecticut	46,630,000	.87	44	Idaho	1,619,000	.03
18	Missouri	37,035,000	.69	45	New Hampshire	1,608,000	.03
19	Vermont	28,949,000	.54	46	South Dakota	1,602,000	.03
20	Maryland	28,794,000	.54	47	Hawaii	1,520,000	.03
21	Oregon	28,455,000	.53	48	Montana	1,169,000	.02
22	Kansas	27,839,000	.52	49	Nevada	838,000	.02
23	Washington	26,850,000	.50	50	Alaska	603,000	.01
24	Rhode Island	24,352,000	.45	51	Wyoming	551,000	.01
25	Tennessee	21,626,000	.40				
26	Kentucky	18,504,000	.35				
27	West Virginia	15,764,000	.29	Total		$5,352,513,000	100.00

TABLE 9. Rank Order of Undergraduate Need-Based State Scholarship/Grant Mean Award Values, 1979-80

State	Mean Award	State	Mean Award
1. Alaska	$1,500	30. Mississippi	$504
2. South Carolina	1,388	31. Nebraska	504
3. California	1,277	32. Wyoming	502
4. District of Columbia	1,199	33. Utah	501
5. Iowa	1,143	34. New Mexico	480
6. Illinois	976	35. Ohio	468
7. Michigan	924	36. Maryland	452
8. Florida	867	37. Oregon	452
9. Connecticut	817	38. Louisiana	415
10. Minnesota	775	39. New Hampshire	414
11. Colorado	768	40. Kentucky	390
12. Indiana	768	41. North Dakota	374
13. Kansas	756	42. Delaware	344
14. Maine	750	43. Missouri	321
15. Rhode Island	730	44. Alabama	300
16. Texas	703	45. Montana	300
17. Vermont	692	46. South Dakota	300
18. Arizona	675	47. Arkansas	276
		48. Virginia	270
ALL STATES	675	49. Georgia	249
		50. Oklahoma	222
19. Pennsylvania	649	51. Hawaii	167
20. New York	644		
21. West Virginia	623		
22. Massachusetts	611		
23. North Carolina	569		
24. Tennessee	559		
25. New Jersey	557		
26. Idaho	531		
27. Nevada	530		
28. Wisconsin	523		
29. Washington	513		

programs expressing a deep and lasting commitment to state student aid. We are simply pointing out that, at this time, they typify states that have not considered student aid as an important part of their support structure for higher education and, quite possibly, would still not have done so without the SSIG.

The pre-SSIG group of states, that established programs after 1969-70 but before 1975-76, are interesting in that they made a commitment patterned after the earlier states. This group is intermediate between the original group and the newest group in size, age, and type of commitment.

In addition to the factors of age and size, a highly useful dimension by which to analyze state-funded student aid is to derive some indication of the relative effort the state invests in student aid. One way to gauge such effort is to compare the level of state-funded student aid activities, such as number of awards and dollars awarded, with the total state population. This measure is essentially a per capita index of effort. Data relating to this index were routinely included in all but the first of the NASSGP reports and are reviewed here as a third variable (in addition to age and size) of considerable potency in reducing

TABLE 10. Rank Order of Indexes of Effort: State Student Aid Dollars Awarded per Total State Population, 1979-80

	STATE	RATIO
1.	New York	$15.31
2.	Vermont	8.82
3.	Pennsylvania	6.88
4.	Illinois	6.63
5.	Minnesota	5.94
6.	Iowa	5.30
7.	New Jersey	5.18
8.	Wisconsin	4.51
9.	Rhode Island	4.50
10.	Indiana	4.01
	ALL STATES	3.94
11.	California	3.82
12.	South Carolina	3.69
13.	Michigan	3.30
14.	Colorado	3.07
15.	Ohio	2.09
16.	Massachusetts	2.81
17.	Connecticut	2.77
18.	Oregon	2.39
19.	Kansas	2.00
20.	Missouri	1.87
21.	West Virginia	1.63
22.	District of Columbia	1.57
23.	Kentucky	1.53
24.	Tennessee	1.44
25.	Texas	1.44
26.	Maryland	1.34
27.	Washington	1.30
28.	Maine	1.25
29.	Florida	1.23
30.	Utah	1.18
31.	Delaware	.95
32.	Oklahoma	.80
33.	Arizona	.78
34.	Nevada	.77
35.	Virginia	.74
36.	Alabama	.67
37.	Georgia	.67
38.	North Dakota	.64
39.	Wyoming	.62
40.	New Hampshire	.61
41.	South Dakota	.61
42.	New Mexico	.60
43.	North Carolina	.60

the formidable diversity of state student aid to manageable dimensions. Table C in the Appendix contains the indexes of effort (state student aid award dollars per total state population) for all states with programs for each year from 1970-71 through 1979-80. Table 10 contains the state indexes of effort by rank order for 1979-80.

TABLE 10. Rank Order of Indexes of Effort: State Student Aid Dollars Awarded per Total State Population, 1979-80 (continued)

	STATE	RATIO
44.	Alaska	.58
45.	Idaho	.58
46.	Nebraska	.55
47.	Montana	.54
48.	Arkansas	.51
49.	Hawaii	.51
50.	Mississippi	.46
51.	Louisiana	.22

When state student aid expenditures are compared on a standardized (per capita) basis, thus greatly reducing the impact of state size, different interrelationships emerge. Note that in Table 10, some of the states smaller in population have the higher indexes of effort, that is, the rate of expenditure per total state population is higher than in most other states regardless of how populous those states are. For example, Vermont, Iowa, and Rhode Island are ranked in the highest 10, along with such populous states as New York, Pennsylvania, and Illinois.

A general interrelationship between size of program (number of awards and dollars awarded), age of program, and index of effort is observable. Comparisons between Tables 1 (age), 7, and 8 (number of awards and dollars awarded, respectively), and Table 10 (index of effort) show that in general: states that have had programs at least 10 years tend to be most of the larger programs, and usually rank high in indexes of effort. The converse is also true: the smaller programs are generally newer and rank lower in indexes of effort.

A term which readily characterizes the smaller state programs is "emerging." The larger, older, and higher effort states can be characterized as "established." The group of states intermediate in age, size, and index of effort, between the "established" and "emerging" states, can accurately be termed "evolving." Because these three terms are highly descriptive, they will be used to identify the three elements of a dimension that will, we hope, assist in analysis of the extremely diverse state programs. This strategy assumes that the three variables of age, size, and index of effort are generally intercorrelated. If the states are grouped according to the joint distributions of the three variables, the differences within the groups will be considerably less than those among the groups. In that case, the groups, or representative samples of them, can be better analyzed in relation to other variables of interest, because the potent factors of age, size, and index of effort will already be taken into account by the grouping.

In Table 11 we list the states according to the joint occurrence of age and size, and also indicate the index of effort rank in parentheses.

In Table 11 there is considerable clustering of states along the diagonal of the joint distribution of age and size, indicating a moderately strong relationship. In addition, the ranked index of effort shows that there is a general relationship with the joint distribution of age and size. Within the table's upper left square, containing the 10 largest and oldest (established) state programs, the ranks of index of effort range from 1 to 15. Conversely, within the table's lower right square, containing the 12 newest and smallest (emerging) state programs the ranks of index of effort range from 34 to 51 with the exception of the District of Columbia, which is ranked 22nd. The middle square, which contains state programs that are intermediate, ranges from 12 to 28.

TABLE 11. State Student Financial Aid Agencies by Size (Funds Appropriated), Age (Number of Years Established), and Index of Effort (Funds Appropriated per Capita) in 1979-80

Size (Funds Appropriated, 1979-80)	Age (Number of Years Established)		
	10 years or more (20 states)	7-10 years (8 states)	Less than 7 years (23 states)
Over $20,000,000 (10 states)	N.Y.(1)*, Pa.(3), Ill.(4), Minn.(5), N.J.(7), Wis.(8), Ind.(10), Calif.(11), Mich.(13), Ohio(15)		
$1,000,000 - $20,000,000 (26 states)	Vt.(2), Iowa(6), R.I.(9), Mass.(16), Conn.(17), Oreg.(18), Kans.(19), W.Va.(21), Md.(26), Fla.(29)	S.C.(12), Mo.(20), Tenn.(24), Tex.(25), Wash.(27), Maine(28)	Colo.(14), Ky.(23), Utah(30), Okla.(32), Ariz.(33), Va.(35), Ala.(36), Ga.(37), N.C.(43), Miss.(50)
Less than $1,000,000 (15 states)		Del.(31), N.D.(38), Alaska(44)	D.C.(22), Nev.(34), Wyo.(39), N.H.(40), S.D.(41), N.M.(42), Idaho(45), Nebr.(46), Mont.(47), Ark.(48), Hawaii(49), La.(51)

*(Index of Effort Ranking, 1979-80, shown in parentheses; underlined states selected for analysis groups.)

The five underlined states in each of the three diagonal squares have been selected to represent the three analysis groups of established, evolving and emerging states. The established group are the five highest ranked states in the square. Of the five, Minnesota and New Jersey are not nearly as populous as New York, Pennsylvania, and Illinois, but they qualify highly on the three variables of age, size of program, and index of effort. The evolving group of states cluster tightly in the intermediate range of index of effort, ranging from 20 to 28. Maine is included in the intermediate age group because it initiated its present need-based, comprehensive program in 1973-74. This group of states is by far the most diverse in many respects related to student aid. The emerging states selected are clustered tightly at the bottom range of index of effort, ranking from 45 to 51.

In the analyses presented in the next chapters, these three groups of five states each will be used to examine various facets of state student aid.

TABLE 12. Total State Appropriations for Student Grants and Higher Education Operating Funds, 1969-70 through 1979-80* (Dollar Amounts Shown in Millions: Add 000)

Year	Student Grants (millions)	Operations (millions)	Percentage Grants to Operation
1969-70	$199.923	$ 3,794.831	5.27
1970-71	236.282	4,769.620	4.95
1971-72	274.911	5,509.739	4.99
1972-73	312.271	6,473.051	4.82
1973-74	363.888	8,006.462	4.54
1974-75	423.022	9,831.854	4.30
1975-76	488.918	12,313.970	3.97
1976-77	605.189	13,865.067	4.36
1977-78	676.358	15,350.386	4.41
1978-79	725.829	16,964.031	4.28
1979-80	778.373	19,075.829	4.08
Cumulative Total	$5,084.964	$115,954.840	4.39

*Includes only states each year with aid programs.

Sources: Source for student grant data is the annual NASSGP Survey. Source for operations data is the annual state surveys, Appropriations of State Tax Funds for Operating Expenses of Higher Education, by M. M. Chambers.

RELATIONSHIP OF STATE STUDENT AID WITH FUNDING FOR INSTITUTIONAL OPERATIONS AND WITH FEDERAL PROGRAMS

Decisions at the state level on student grants are often made in relation to federal student aid programs and also to all funds provided by the state for higher education within the state. This chapter analyzes relationships and delineates their significant variations among states. The dramatic increase in federal Basic Educational Opportunity Grant (BEOG) dollars at the close of the '70s caused most states to assess carefully how their state programs of grant aid could best serve the financial needs of students. This chapter will show national data as well as data for three different types of representative state programs—established, evolving, and emerging.

State Student Grant Funds in Relation to State Funds for Higher Education Operation Budgets

The funds appropriated each year from 1969-70 through 1979-80 for need-based student grants and for total state higher education operation budgets are shown in Table 12. The source of

the data on state operating budgets is the series of annual surveys conducted by M.M. Chambers and published in summary form by the National Association of State Universities and Land-Grant Colleges (see Technical Note 2).

State appropriations for institutional operating funds and student grants increased from 1969-70 through 1979-80, however, the operating fund appropriations increased more than the student grant funds. Consequently, the ratio of student grant to institutional operating funds decreased through the 1970s. The highest percentage (5.27) occurred in 1969-70. A general decline occurred from that point to 1975-76, then a recovery occurred in the next two years followed by a decline from 4.41 percent in 1977-78, to 4.08 percent in 1979-80. This would have translated into $62.9 million more dollars in 1979-80 in student aid, if the percentage for 1977-78 had held. The drop is a result both of dramatic new federal funding for students aid and of $17.0 million more over the two years available to the states in SSIG (State Student Incentive Grant) funds. Data depicting the relationship between state student aid and institutional operating funds for all 50 states for each year from 1969-70 through 1979-80 are presented in Table B in the Appendix.

Table 13 displays the mean percentage of scholarship/grant funds to higher education operations for the five representative states in each of the established, evolving and emerging categories.

The established states (except Minnesota) have by public policy allocated 9 percent to 13 percent of all higher education appropriations (excluding capital expenses) into student grants. The evolving states average about 1 percent and the emerging states average only .02 percent. Clearly, the states are highly diverse in the priority each gives student gift aid. Evidently, age of the state program is an important variable in the relationship with total state funds for operating higher education because the rationale and political constituency for state support of student aid are built up over time.

State Student Grant Funds in Relation to Selected Federal Student Aid Programs

Four variables—state funded gift aid, federal SSIG (State Student Incentive Grants), federal BEOG (recently retitled Pell Grants), and federal SEOG (Supplemental Educational Opportunity Grants)—are shown in Table 14 for the years of 1969-70 to 1979-80. These three federal programs have affected state student grant programs most significantly during the period of this study. As with state programs, we focus on the federal gift (nonrepayable) programs to the exclusion of loans, and College Work-Study. Note also that we have not included categorical, highly targeted programs, such as those in the health field.

Many changes occurred in the relationship between federal and state student aid during the 1970s. The BEOG program represented two-thirds of all taxpayer gift aid dollars (federal and state) available to needy students in 1979-80. This proportion grew from a base of only 8 percent in 1974-75 and 35 percent in 1975-76. BEOG or Pell Grants have become the dominant and most important source of tax-funded student gift aid. SSIG and SEOG have remained about 2 percent and 8-10 percent respectively over the past four years. Most states increased their appropriations for state awards each year and yet, since 1975-76, the percentage that states' gift aid efforts represent of all government need-based aid has ranged between 23.2 and 29.2 percent. As shown in Table 14, the states, collectively, have become a "junior" partner to the federal government.

It is also noteworthy that, since 1975-76, the dollars of government aid based upon need have doubled from $1,680,700,000 in 1975-76, to $3,342,300,000 in 1979-80.

An analysis of the roles SEOG, BEOG, and state gift aid dollars play in the representative established, evolving, and emerging states is shown in Table 15.

States with established programs provide about 2.4 times more total state gift aid dollars than their share of the U.S. population. In addition, their use of BEOG dollars

TABLE 13. Mean Value (Percentage) of Established, Evolving, and Emerging State Scholarship/Grant Dollars to All Dollars for Operations in Higher Education

(Data Only for Years with Scholarship/Grant Programs)

	# Years	Mean Percentage State Gift Aid Dollars to Operation Dollars
Established		
Illinois	11	8.94%
Minnesota	11	3.21%
New Jersey	11	9.38%
New York	11	12.17%
Pennsylvania	11	12.76%
Mean		9.29%
Evolving		
Maine	8	.94%
Missouri	7	1.84%
Tennessee	8	1.00%
Texas	9	.90%
Washington	11	.76%
Mean		1.09%
Emerging		
Arkansas	5	.21%
Idaho	5	.23%
Louisiana	5	.12%
Montana	4	.27%
Nebraska	6	.19%
Mean		.20%
Mean All States-All Years		4.54%

in 1978-79 was 2.16 percent above their share of the U.S. population. While a small percentage, this 2.16 percent translates into 31.6 million dollars more than their population share. The higher cost of colleges in these states and possibly extra efforts made to have needy applicants apply has made a difference. In the established states student aid was "big business" by the time the massive federal programs got under way. It follows that the apparatus, in terms of student aid professionals and procedures, was available and adaptable for utilizing the new federal programs.

As noted in Table 15, the evolving and emerging states tended to receive approximately their proportionate shares of federal dollars; however, their provision of state tax funds for student aid fell far below their shares proportionate to the U.S. population.

These three separate analyses indicate most dramatic differences between federal and state efforts by respective states in meeting college costs of financially needy students. Where a student resides, or where a respective college is located, can and does greatly influence how needy students meet college costs.

TABLE 14. Need-Based State and Federal Undergraduate Grant Dollars 1969-70 through 1979-80 (Dollar Amounts in Millions)

Year	Federal Programs									State Programs			Total	
	SSIG[1]	% of Total	Percentage Change from Base 100.0	BEOG[2]	% of Total	Percentage Change from Base 100.0	SEOG[3]	% of Total	Percentage Change from Base 100.0	State Funded Gift Aid	% of Total	Percentage Change from Base 100.0	Total State & Federal Dollars	Percentage Change from Base 100.0
1969-70	-			-			$ 124.6	38.4	100.0	$ 199.9	61.6	100.0	$ 324.5	100.0
1970-71	-			-			167.7	41.5	134.6	236.3	58.5	118.2	404.0	124.5
1971-72	-			-			177.3	39.8	142.3	268.3	60.2	134.2	445.6	137.3
1972-73	-			-			210.3	40.0	168.8	315.5	60.0	157.8	525.8	162.7
1973-74	-			$ 49.9	8.0	100.0	210.3	33.7	168.8	364.2	58.3	182.2	624.4	192.4
1974-75	$ 19.0	1.9	100.0	356.5	35.4	714.4	210.3	20.9	168.8	421.8	41.9	211.0	1007.6	310.5
1975-76	20.0	1.2	105.3	929.6	55.3	1862.9	240.3	14.3	192.9	490.8	29.2	245.5	1680.7	517.9
1976-77	44.0	1.9	231.6	1463.9	62.2	2933.7	240.1	10.2	192.7	607.4	25.8	303.9	2355.4	725.9
1977-78	60.0	2.3	315.8	1575.0	61.5	3156.3	249.6	9.7	200.3	677.0	26.4	338.7	2561.6	789.4
1978-79	63.8	2.5	335.8	1462.8	58.1	2931.5	265.7	10.6	213.2	725.4	28.8	362.9	2517.7	775.9
1979-80	76.8	2.3	404.2	2220.0	66.4	4448.9	270.0	8.1	216.7	775.5	23.2	387.9	3342.3	1030.0
Total 1969-80	283.6	1.8		8057.7	51.0		2366.2	15.0		5082.1	32.2		15789.6	

1. State Student Incentive Grant
2. Basic Educational Opportunity Grant, also called Pell Grants
3. Supplemental Educational Opportunity Grant (in 1969-70 through 1971-72 these were called Educational Opportunity Grants)

TABLE 15. Percentage of U.S. Total Federal Program Dollars for Established, Evolving, and Emerging States

	SEOG	BEOG	SSIG	PERCENTAGE OF ALL STATES GIFT AID DOLLARS
ESTABLISHED (Illinois, Minnesota, New Jersey, New York, Pennsylvania)				
23.77% of U.S. 1977 Population				
1971-72	23.64	----	----	70.06
1972-73	23.95	----	----	68.14
1973-74	22.67	25.70	----	62.18
1974-75	22.59	23.84	25.98	60.41
1975-76	21.63	24.33	24.12	57.54
1976-77	21.45	25.19	22.94	57.83
1977-78	21.78	24.65	23.19	56.76
1978-79	21.69	25.93	23.35	57.00
EVOLVING (Maine, Missouri, Tennessee, Texas, Washington)				
11.87% of U.S. 1977 Population				
1971-72	11.28	----	----	.88
1972-73	11.23	----	----	1.66
1973-74	11.43	11.69	----	2.91
1974-75	12.28	11.79	12.92	3.53
1975-76	12.05	11.59	11.54	3.92
1976-77	12.14	11.26	11.12	2.67
1977-78	11.97	10.98	11.18	2.75
1978-79	12.43	10.75	11.18	3.25
EMERGING (Arkansas, Idaho, Louisiana, Montana, Nebraska)				
4.22% of U.S. 1977 Population				
1971-72	4.42	----	----	.00
1972-73	4.37	----	----	.00
1973-74	3.64	5.01	----	.00
1974-75	3.67	4.79	.81	.04
1975-76	3.29	4.66	3.19	.06
1976-77	3.01	4.46	3.27	.17
1977-78	2.64	4.55	3.15	.15
1978-79	2.93	4.52	3.20	.17

The Role of State Student Incentive Grants in the States

In an earlier College Board publication, Hansen (1979) described the development of the SSIG program in considerable detail. We relied heavily on her excellent work in developing this section, and refer the reader to that source for more detailed information.

State Student Incentive Grants, in 1979-80, ranged for each state from a low of 3 percent to 50 percent of all the scholarship/grant funds. Sixteen states used the maximum 50/50 match of state funds with SSIG funds as the total of their 1979-80 gift aid dollars. It can be assumed many of these states entered into a undergraduate scholarship/grant program primarily because of the availability of SSIG funds. Table 16 indicates the relative role SSIG funds played in each state in 1979-80 program(s).

TABLE 16. Percentages of SSIG Federal Dollars to All State-Administered Undergraduate Need-Based Scholarship Grant Dollars, 1979-80

(SSIG Less Than 10% of Total N = 13)			
New York	3%	Indiana	7%
Pennsylvania	4%	South Carolina	8%
Vermont	4%	Wisconsin	8%
Illinois	5%	Rhode Island	9%
Iowa	5%	Michigan	10%
New Jersey	5%	Ohio	10%
Minnesota	6%		
(SSIG 10% to 25% of Total N = 14)			
Connecticut	11%	Kansas	18%
Colorado	13%	Kentucky	18%
California	14%	Maine	20%
Massachusetts	15%	Tennessee	20%
Missouri	17%	Florida	22%
Oregon	17%	Texas	22%
West Virginia	17%	Maryland	25%
(SSIG 25% to 49% of Total N = 8)			
Washington	35%	Georgia	40%
Delaware	36%	Arkansas	42%
Utah	37%	Virginia	42%
North Dakota	37%	Alabama	45%
(SSIG 50% of the Total N = 16)			
Alaska		Nebraska	
Arizona		Nevada	
District of Columbia		New Hampshire	
Hawaii		New Mexico	
Idaho		North Carolina	
Louisiana		Oklahoma	
Mississippi		South Dakota	
Montana		Wyoming	

Trends Requiring Aid Applicants to Demonstrate High Academic Potential in Addition to Need

In 1969-70, most of the states that had student aid programs ranked applicants according to some measure of academic potential. Such ranking was then used to determine the total applicant pool prior to applying a measure of financial need. About $136.9 million was awarded to 23[illegible],500 students on a competitive and need-based formula. In the same year, about $63.0 million was given to 251,000 on a noncompetitive and need-based concept. In 1969-70, about 68.5 percent of all state dollars in need-based awards were in competitive programs.

Some states have maintained both a competitive and a need-based rationale for their programs through the entire period of this study. These states include Arkansas, California, Louisiana, New Hampshire, South Carolina, and West Virginia. A larger number of states have always maintained a sole basis of financial need and never used a competitive basis through the 1970s. These states include Alabama, Alaska, Arizona, Colorado, Georgia,

Hawaii, Idaho, Kentucky, Mississippi, Missouri, Montana, Nebraska, Nevada, New Mexico, North Carolina, North Dakota, Ohio, Oklahoma, South Dakota, Tennessee, Texas, Utah, Washington, and Wyoming.

Beyond the preceding two groups of states, which have not changed the basis of grant awards through the period of this study, the picture becomes much more complex. Some states had both a competitive and a financial-need basis in 1969-70 (or when they started their scholarship/grant program) and by 1979-80 shifted entirely away from the competitive basis. These states included Delaware, Florida, Illinois, Maine, Maryland, Massachusetts, Pennsylvania, Vermont, Virginia, and Wisconsin. In some of these states, the shifts were quite dramatic. For example, two of the largest states in the field of state student aid, namely Illinois and Pennsylvania, had been predominantly competitive based at the start of the decade. Pennsylvania had 98 percent of its awards and 99 percent of its grant dollars in competitive programs; for Illinois these percentages were 66 and 46, respectively.

Four states shifted from a total competition basis in 1969-70 partially to include need-based grants by 1979-80. Connecticut rose to 33 percent awards and 31 percent dollars on a need-only basis by 1979-80; these percentages were 58 and 64 for Indiana, 27 and 18 for Kansas, and 19 and 24 for Rhode Island, respectively.

Finally, six states had begun the decade with a mixed basis of some competitive programs and some need-based only programs, and ended the decade by maintaining the dual bases, but with lower percentages of awards and dollars involved in the competitive programs. These states included Iowa, which dropped from 82 percent awards and 85 percent of its gift aid dollars in competitive programs to only 9 percent awards and 5 percent dollars in competitive programs by the end of the decade. Comparable figures for Michigan were decreases from 70 percent to 60 percent in awards and 58 percent to 52 percent in dollars; for Minnesota the figures dropped from 74 percent in awards to 41 percent and 77 percent in dollars to 43 percent; the drop was from 66 percent to 35 percent in awards and 58 percent to 31 percent in dollars in New Jersey. New York, the largest state student aid provider in the nation, decreased its expenditures in competitive programs from 49 percent to 7 percent, and dropped its percentage of awards from 26 percent to 17 percent. Oregon cut its expenditures for competitive grant programs from 20 percent to 7 percent and decreased its percentage of awards from 7 percent to 6 percent.

By 1974-75, the percentage of all state need-based award dollars had dropped to 28.3 percent (124.5 million of the 440 million dollar total) for the competitive programs. (As usual, the impact of the predominantly large New York program during the early 1970s is most significant here). In 1979-80, competitive programs represented only 20.6 percent of all state need-based dollars with $175.987 millions out of a grand total of $852.295 millions.

Thus, in 10 years a decrease is observed from 68.5 percent to 20.6 percent of all state awards requiring a measure of academic potential. This is a most significant change. Obviously, to serve all levels of students regardless of academic potential, states in the 1970s changed or created new programs of aid which responded to those students enrolling in more "open door" colleges. It is of interest to note that for the last several years, the percentage of all state funded need-based award dollars also awarded competitively has remained consistently at about 20 percent.

A further analysis of three representative types of states of this study, shown in Table 17, reveals an interesting trend. All established states were substantially competitive and need-based in 1969-70 and all became much less so or eliminated the competitive basis by 1979-80. The evolving and emerging states were either 100 percent competitive or only need-based as they started and, with the exception of Maine, have not changed in this regard over the past several years.

TABLE 17. Shift from Competitively Based State Grant Programs to Need-Based Only Programs in Established, Evolving, and Emerging States, 1969-70 to 1979-80 [Percentages-Number of Awards (#) and Award Dollars ($)]

	1969-70 (or Year of Start)	1979-80
Established		
Illinois	66% #/46% $ Competitive	Need Based Only
Minnesota	74% #/74% $ Competitive	41% #/43% $ Competitive
New Jersey	66% #/58% $ Competitive	35% #/31% $ Competitive
New York	26% #/49% $ Competitive	17% #/7% $ Competitive
Pennsylvania	98% #/99% $ Competitive	Need Based Only
Evolving		
Maine	100% #/100% $	Need Based Only
Missouri	Need Based Only	Need Based Only
Tennessee	Need Based Only	Need Based Only
Texas	Need Based Only	Need Based Only
Washington	Need Based Only	Need Based Only
Emerging		
Arkansas	100% #/100% $	100% #/100% $ Competitive
Idaho	Need Based Only	Need Based Only
Louisiana	100% #/100% $	100% #/100% $ Competitive
Montana	Need Based Only	Need Based Only
Nebraska	Need Based Only	Need Based Only

State Student Aid Funds Available for Private and/or Public Colleges

The data shown in Table 18 suggest strongly that state grant funds are used to maintain a level of choice between public colleges and higher-cost private colleges to a degree not occurring with federal student aid funds.

Federal student aid funds would show, in the authors' estimate, about 10 to 15 percent more awards to public institutions and about 10 to 15 percent more of the dollars to students enrolling at public colleges than would state funds. About 80 percent of all state award values are limited to tuition and fees with a higher maximum award for needy students attending private colleges. This factor alone distributes the dollars in a different manner than federal dollars and indicates that state student aid programs can have different purposes than the federal scholarship/grant programs have.

Table 19 shows the results of an analysis of the established, evolving, and emerging states and further highlights the differences between states. Note the larger difference for the established states between the mean award at private and public colleges than is true for the same data for the evolving and emerging states. The higher mean award at public colleges among the established states also indicates higher public tuitions than in the evolving and emerging states.

The evolving states are currently providing a higher percentage of their dollars to private colleges than the established states. With somewhat limited dollars they are by program decision attempting to assist a higher percentage of students at the private sector than either the established or emerging states.

The emerging states are of a different pattern. With very limited funds and with few private colleges in the states, the program(s) predominantly provide dollars to students at

TABLE 18. Distribution to Public/Private Colleges of State Grant Awards and Dollars in 1969-70, and 1975-76 through 1979-80

	Percentage of Awards		Percentage of Award Dollars		Mean Awards		
Year	At Public	At Private	At Public	At Private	At Public	At Private	All Awards
1969-70	46.0	54.0	37.2	62.8	$317	$ 457	$393
1975-76	59.6	40.4	44.6	55.4	$431	$ 789	$576
1976-77	62.0	38.0	46.2	53.8	$440	$ 833	$590
1977-78	61.8	38.2	45.3	54.7	$460	$ 896	$635
1978-79	63.0	37.0	45.2	54.8	$479	$ 986	$648
1979-80	61.5	38.5	41.1	58.9	$451	$1,034	$675

TABLE 19. Established, Evolving, and Emerging States Distribution of Awards/Dollars by Public, Private Sector, 1975-76 through 1979-80

	Percentage Awards		Percentage Award Dollars		Mean Award		Mean Award Difference Public/Private	
	Public	Private	Public	Private	Public	Private	All	
Established								
1975-76	60.8	39.2	48.1	51.9	$415	$693	$524	$278
1976-77	63.9	36.1	48.1	51.9	$410	$782	$544	$372
1977-78	64.2	35.8	51.7	48.3	$468	$785	$582	$317
1978-79	63.7	36.3	46.4	53.6	$478	$970	$656	$492
1979-80	61.5	38.5	43.2	56.8	$476	$999	$677	$523
Evolving								
1975-76	38.0	62.0	27.8	72.2	$346	$550	$472	$204
1976-77	42.1	57.9	30.5	69.5	$340	$561	$468	$221
1977-78	43.1	56.9	30.5	69.5	$335	$577	$473	$242
1978-79	53.0	47.0	32.1	67.9	$287	$684	$474	$397
1979-80	54.5	45.5	33.1	66.9	$318	$768	$523	$450
Emerging								
1975-76	85.0	15.0	80.8	19.2	$353	$476	$372	$123
1976-77	81.7	18.3	77.9	22.1	$339	$429	$355	$ 90
1977-78	80.0	20.0	72.7	27.3	$349	$524	$384	$175
1978-79	82.4	17.6	72.0	28.0	$307	$560	$351	$253
1979-80	73.1	26.9	66.1	33.9	$334	$467	$370	$133

public colleges. The mean awards are relatively small and there is very little mean difference between an award for a student enrolled at a public and one at a private institution.

OVERVIEW AND SUMMARY

State-funded student gift aid has, in recent years, become an important part of the overall picture of student financial aid. However, general trends, growth, and development of this sector have not been thoroughly studied and discussed in the research literature. This study attempts to remedy that deficiency.

The state role has been as a partner with both the institutions and the federal government. As the 1970s opened, aggregate state expenditures for gift aid exceeded that of the federal government; the states spent about $200 million to about $144 million for the Educational Opportunity Grant program, the lone federal comprehensive gift aid program in 1969-70. However, the federal government by 1980 provided about 80 percent of total student financial aid, with the institutional sources and state sources accounting about equally for the balance. These proportions have held for the three or four years ending the 1970s and starting the 1980s. However, there are considerable uncertainties about the continuing dominance of the role of the federal government. Whatever developments and changes may occur in the balance among the three financial-aid partners, the state role will evidently remain at least as important as it has been over the last 10 to 15 years and quite possibly expand significantly. As of the 1980-81 academic year, the total state expenditures for student financial aid are nearly one billion years annually, a significant effort by any standards.

This study is the first longitudinal analysis of the 1970s, the decade of greatest growth of state financial aid. During the 11 year period from 1969-70 through 1979-80, the number of states with comprehensive programs of gift (nonrepayable) student aid increased from 19 to include all 50 states plus the District of Columbia and all eligible trust territories. The number of awards made to students during this period grew from about 470,000 to 1,262,350, and the total funds awarded grew from just under $200,000,000 in 1969-70 to $852,300,000 in 1979-80.

The main data base used to describe program growth and development is the reports of annual surveys by the National Association of State Scholarship and Grant Programs. These reports include data on many different programs, including work-study and categorical grants made for special purposes. This study, however, focuses exclusively on the main type of program by which states provide student financial aid, namely, nonrepayable grants made primarily on the basis of need to all eligible students admissible to approved educational institutions. Generally, this definition is applied very broadly. For example, most states attempt to provide grants to all eligible students rather than on a competitive or selective basis. Furthermore, the range of institutions considered eligible is normally very liberal, including not only public and private universities, liberal arts colleges, and community colleges, but also proprietary and other postsecondary institutions. For most purposes in this study, the relatively small number of scholarships and dollars awarded in competitive ability-based programs are included with the need-based grants.

Three stages of growth were discernible over the span of the 11 years encompassed in this study. In the first stage (concluded by 1969-70), only three states had established programs before World War II as an integral part of providing higher education for state citizens. Sixteen more states established programs during the late 1950s and through the 1960s for numerous purposes, including recruitment of academic and other special talents, providing access for economically disadvantaged youth, and maintaining balance between the public and private sectors. A second stage of growth occurred when nine additional states reported to the NASSGP surveys that they had also established programs. Many of these were also attempting to deal directly with the questions of access and choice, however, during

this period the shift from scholarship (ability-based) aid to grant (need-based only) aid resulted in the vast majority of awards being made on the latter basis. The third stage of growth occurred largely in response to the initiatives of the State Scholarship Incentive Grants made available to the states under the Higher Education Amendments of 1972. During this last stage of growth, all of the remaining states established programs providing state funds to students to attend postsecondary institutions. Many of the states in the last stage of growth limited their expenditures to simply matching the relatively small funding amounts available under the SSIG.

All through the history of state-funded student financial aid, a very marked imbalance or variability has been demonstrated in the level of funding and the number of awards provided among the states. Specifically, in all but one of the 11 years in this study, the five largest states in terms of dollars awarded were, in order, New York, Pennsylvania, Illinois, California, and New Jersey. During this period, these five largest states typically constituted nearly two-thirds of the number of awards and of the total dollar amount of funds awarded. By 1979-80, about 15 additional states had established programs of significant size, even though the five largest states still provided well over half of the dollars awarded. The largest 20 states in 1979-80 provided 89.52 percent of total awards and 92.40 percent of all the dollars awarded. All of the remaining 37 states and trust territories have relatively small programs, and nearly all of these have been only recently established.

During analysis of the NASSGP data, it became evident that the variability among the states in student financial aid called for differentiation among the states according to some of the more important criteria. For example, it is obvious that little commonality exists between New York, which established its first program in 1913 and by 1979-80 provided over a quarter of a billion dollars to nearly half a million students, and such states as Alaska, Idaho, and Nevada that, in aggregate, awarded less than one and a half million dollars to fewer than 2,000 students in 1979-80.

Using state student aid dollars awarded per capita in each state as an "index of effort," great variability was found among the states over the 11 years of this study. In 1979-80, the average index for all states combined was $3.94, but the range was from $15.31 in New York to $0.22 in Louisiana.

To reduce the extreme diversity among state programs to an extent that would allow meaningful analysis, the three variables of age of program (number of years in operation), size of program, and the state's index of effort were jointly used to define three groups of states, which were termed "established," "evolving," and "emerging." In each group, a sample of five states were selected to typify the total group. The established group comprised Illinois, Minnesota, New York, New Jersey, and Pennsylvania. They are all states with long-established, large programs and high indexes of effort. Evolving states included Maine, Missouri, Tennessee, Texas, and Washington—all states with programs of intermediate age, size, and index of effort. Emerging states comprised Arkansas, Idaho, Louisiana, Montana, and Nebraska—all newly established state programs with small programs and low indexes of effort. This clustering approach proved useful in analyzing other variables.

State student aid has increased more slowly than direct state appropriations for institutional operations. In 1969-70, the amount of student aid funds compared to funds to operations was 5.27 percent. This percentage declined to 3.97 in 1975-76, rose again to 4.41 percent in 1977-78 then declined to 4.08 percent in 1979-80. In general, these changes can be related to the level of federal student aid spending, especially for the massive BEOG program. The mean percentage for five established states for the 11 year period was 9.29; for the evolving and emerging states these ratios were 1.09 and .02 percent respectively for the years in which these states had programs.

As the three major federal programs that succeeded the Educational Opportunity Grants entered the picture (SEOG in 1971-72, BEOG in 1973-74, and SSIG in 1974-75) the percentage of all taxpayer gift aid need-based dollars appropriated by the state dropped to 41.9 percent in 1974-75 and further declined to 25.7 percent in 1976-77. The percentage has remained near

that level since 1976-77, with states providing an estimated 23.3 percent compared to the 76.7 percent provided by the federal government in 1979-80. The three analysis groups of states showed great differences in their shares of federal program dollars. In 1979-80, the five established states garnered 25.9 percent of all BEOG or Pell Grant dollars, the evolving states received 10.7 percent and the emerging states were awarded 4.5 percent.

The SSIG program tends to affect large, long-established states very little. Of the original 19 states in 1969-70, only two received as much as 20 percent of their total funds awarded from the SSIG program. However, a large number (16) of states with newly established, small programs only matched the minimum of 50 percent in 1979-80 of state dollars with the federal SSIG dollars.

State-funded student aid shifted emphatically from a competitive philosophy (a measure of academic potential required in addition to financial need) to a noncompetitive and totally need-based philosophy. In 1969-70, about 68.5 percent of all state dollars awarded were in competitive programs. By 1974-75, this percentage had dropped to 28.3 percent, and in 1979-80 competitive need-based programs represented only 20.6 percent of all state need-based dollars.

The private sector participates in state student aid differently according to the state's traditions and overall views on the importance of maintaining student choice of institution. In general, the percentage of both awards and dollars accruing to students in the private sector has dropped in relation to those in the public sector. In 1969-70, 54 percent of awards and 62.8 percent of the total dollars went to the private sector. By 1979-80, these percentages dropped to 38.5 and 58.9, respectively. However, the mean award showed a larger increase in the private sector. In 1969-70, the average award was $457 to private college students compared to $317 to students in the public sector. In 1979-80, these mean figures were $1,034 and $451, respectively.

A FORECAST OF STATE STUDENT AID IN THE 1980s

This report shows that the states vary widely in their direct support of student aid. Some of the more important factors and conditions relating to these differences are as follows:

1. Historical state views toward the support of higher education inevitably influence current attitudes and actual programs in student gift aid.

2. The balance of enrollment between the public and private sectors undoubtedly influences propensity toward providing access or choice or both. States with predominantly public colleges tend to support access goals and thus provide mostly noncompetitive grants based on need alone. Conversely, states with a strong, traditional, private sector pursue the goal of choice by offsetting large differences in costs of attendance between public and private colleges. Some states attempt to maintain both access and choice by providing not only a broad grant program giving wide access to public institutions for needy students, but also providing awards tied closely to cost differences between public and private colleges.

3. Precedent for a state policy of cultivating youth who are intellectually or otherwise gifted dates back at least as far as Jefferson's early nineteenth-century plan for the University of Virginia. This tradition is still perpetuated in some states as a means to develop leadership among the state's citizenry, raise or maintain academic standards in the state's institutions, and to encourage a socially beneficial student diversity.

4. Some states have emphasized the provision of numerous low-cost public institutions (many easily accessible to commuting students as a further way to reduce cost of attendance) to attain the goal of wide access. Many, but not all such states, attain

the goal of choice by providing relatively large awards to students who select more costly private colleges.

5. Conversely, some states impose a policy of relatively high tuitions at public colleges, but offset their enrollment-inhibiting effects by offering entitlement grants to the financially needy.

6. In some states, gift student aid is viewed as a more beneficial alternative to the costs of countering youth unemployment and underemployment.

7. Financial aid to students is a legal and politically acceptable alternative to direct financial support to private colleges that could not otherwise be assisted because of constitutional or judicial restrictions.

8. Specially targeted student grants can be used to influence enrollment patterns, for example, in certain areas such as health-related fields, between public and private sectors, and to encourage attendance at relatively under-enrolled institutions of various types and in certain locations.

9. Grants available to students for use at any public or private college they might select further extend the concept of choice to allow the student as consumer to determine his or her most desirable campus and program.

10. Widely publicized and easily available grants undoubtedly encourage attendance by many traditional-age and older students who have minimal basic competencies and allow them the opportunity to further develop their skills to a satisfying and marketable level.

RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN STATE AND FEDERAL STUDENT AID

All states are uncertain about the immediate and long-term impact of such massive federal programs as BEOG or Pell Grants on their own gift-aid programs. Federal student aid has never developed under consistent policies, consequently congressional initiatives have been unpredictable, maintenance of programs has been uncertain, and regulations have been somewhat arbitrarily and inconsistently interpreted and enforced. Furthermore, it seems that no effective mechanism or organizational structure is likely to be set up in the near future (see Fenske, 1981, especially pp. 13-21).

As the '80s begin, there is considerable uncertainty about the balance among gift aid, loans, self-help (student savings and employment), and parental support that the federal government will want through the decade. Whatever balance among these student aid sources is struck through the next 10 years will undoubtedly affect the states' student aid policies as significantly as it has through the past decade. For example, the emphasis through the late '70s on noncompetitive need-based grants provided by the federal government and many of the states has weaned many parents away from the expectation of family sacrifice to send sons and daughters to college. Any significant retrenchment from the present high levels of gift aid will cause considerable political problems for the state student aid agencies. Cutbacks in BEOG could throw intolerable burdens on state student grant programs.

All states, whatever their level of involvement in funding student aid, are directly affected by federal initiatives. States with only small-scale "emerging" programs are almost entirely at the mercy of the federal decisions. Many such states now only match federal SSIG funds and sponsor a Guaranteed Student Loan agency. Cutbacks or reduction in either of these programs would decimate these states' new efforts and cause political reactions all out of proportion to the money actually spent by the state.

States with long-established programs and large expenditures are also affected by federal initiatives. For example, the rapid growth of BEOG encouraged many states to deemphasize

their own gift-aid programs under the assumption that the goal of access would be reached by the federal grants. Consequently, some of these states shifted their funding to support the goal of choice by diverting proportionately more money to private college students. A cutback in the BEOG program would require these states either to pick up the slack in grant aid to public college students and deemphasize the new support for the private sector, or to continue the latter support levels and ignore the shortfall in grant aid for public college students, many of whom have exceptional financial need and are often racial or ethnic minorities. Whatever the choice, the states will inherit problems they neither wanted nor anticipated.

Viewed in aggregate and over the entire span of their growth period, the states have exhibited a more orderly and coherent development of student aid than have the federal student aid initiatives. This orderliness and coherence may be undermined by abrupt and unpredictable changes at the federal level, just as was true to some extent for gift-aid programs in the '70s.

Inflation, increasing at the current level, will in many states cause significant increases in both public and private institution tuition charges. State student aid programs, under these conditions, will be the one means to provide tuition dollars to the financially needy student at public colleges in order to provide access and to students at private colleges to give reasonable choice among the institutions of the state. State scholarship/grant funds will no doubt be unable to "keep up" with inflationary costs. Furthermore, the 1980s will see additional increases in part-time and older adult enrollment. Each state will be under pressure to extend its funding and eligibility criteria to include this type of student.

As college costs soar, each state will carefully look at ways it can assist in meeting costs—gift aid, guaranteed loans, and work-study programs. To maximize limited dollars, a few states may soon be requiring packages of state funds that include all three of these parts. In such a package, gift aid would be available only in combination with a required loan and a job paid by work-study funds. This change will be sharply different from operations over the past several years. Many states have for years given needy students their choice of gift, loan, or employment aid. However, some states will now see the "required package" approach as a way to meet extensive state student aid needs with limited dollars. There may also be a return to heavy reliance on parental support.

The recent growth of state-funded student gift-aid dollars has helped preserve both strong public and private colleges in many states. This purpose will be under new stress in the years ahead. Some will argue that additional dollars should go to faculty salaries (operating budgets) to keep the best-qualified people in the teaching profession. Others will plead for a dramatic expansion of funds for consortia programs to encourage more colleges to do more things together, to serve students better and to save dollars. Others will decide that public tuitions should significantly increase for all students and that additional state grant dollars must be provided first to financially needy students. Students from affluent homes will be expected to pay the higher public tuitions.

Regardless of how each state elects to use its higher education dollars in the years ahead, the most significant impact on state student aid programs will be the decisions made by the federal government—especially in the BEOG or Pell Grant program and the Guaranteed Student Loan program.

In 1979-80, BEOG funding totaled about three times the total undergraduate need-based grant aid provided by the states. If the BEOG maximum award continues to increase significantly and can be used to fund an ever-increasing percentage of the college budget, the need for state student aid dollars will diminish in the years ahead. This fact could frustrate many states, because they wish to accomplish certain purposes with their own aid programs that are not fully met in the BEOG program. One result, controversial in nature, may be a dramatic increase by the states in academic awards, not based upon need, with an expressed desire to reward excellence and keep high ability students enrolled in their own states. This effort would be strongly opposed by those who believe higher education should be an

"open door" to all, regardless of their measured abilities or high school grade performance, and who fear that dollars for the average student will decline as academic awards increase.

One means available to the federal government to permit most states to "fine tune" and not dramatically change their current student aid gift programs is to increase substantially SSIG funds.

To date, SSIG has been a form of revenue sharing with only minimum federal requirements. If this latitude remains, the federal government can contribute greatly to keep states from changing what the 1970s produced—a significant state response in need-based student aid programs. Such need-based programs keep a healthy balance between the public and private sectors by providing a reasonable opportunity for a state's residents to attend the college of their choice.

Many states have, by policy, created scholarship/grant programs to achieve purposes not sought to the same degree in federal student aid programs. These policies included limiting the awards to tuition and fees to provide a more reasonable choice among colleges; providing separate programs for needy students of high academic potential and for needy students at private colleges, to promote diversity and reasonable choice. The $583 mean award difference for all states' awards in 1979-80 ($1,034 mean award at private colleges and $451 mean award at public colleges) provided a distribution of total dollars by sector in 1979-80 in marked contrast to federal need-based programs.

The need for close working relationships and coordination between federal and state-funded need-based undergraduate grants is essential in the 1980s. In 1979-80, these two levels of government provided $3,348,000,000 of grant assistance. Many hundreds of thousands of students are now benefiting from both federal and state funds. The challenge of the 1980s is how to interrelate federal and state programs to realize both the federal purpose and individual states' purposes in balancing the goals of access to, and reasonable choice among, postsecondary institutions.

TECHNICAL NOTES

1. Despite rigorous cross-checking and validation of available data, some disparity continues to exist regarding the years in which some of the state programs were first established. Some of the problems concern definition. For example, as program emphasis moved to need-based comprehensive programs and away from competitive ability-based and/or categorical programs, interest centered more on establishing when the new type of programs began and away from when the state initially began any type of state-funded program. Thus, Maryland had a small categorical program of a patronage nature dating from the nineteenth century, but established a comprehensive need-based program in the early 1970s. In Table 1, Maryland is, therefore, included in the original 1969-70 group of 19 states, as is Maine, which had established a competitive program for that year. Maine, however, discontinued its program and did not report further state-funded aid until four years later when it reinstituted an aid program. The new program was need-based and comprehensive.

Other problems concerned survey response rather than definition. Washington State evidently had a program by 1969-70, but did not respond to the survey until 1971-72 when it provided data also for 1970-71 and 1969-70. This accounts for the fact that Washington is included in Table 4, but not in Table 1. The former table was prepared from retroactive data from the 1971-72 NASSGP survey, while Table 1 listed those states that responded to the original 1969-70 survey. The case of Delaware was very similar to that of Washington.

The overall strategy in this report is to use the data from the states that responded to the annual NASSGP surveys because this information is standardized. This criterion supersedes all other sources of information, but leads to some internal inconsistencies as indicated. An exhaustive, authoritative, investigation of the historical origins of all state-funded student aid programs would be a valuable addition to knowledge in this field.

2. The difficulty of obtaining accurate, comparable, and timely financial data on higher education is a problem that has existed for a long time and still persists. For example, the National Commission on the Financing of Postsecondary Education (1973) concluded its major chapter on current financing patterns in its final report with two recommendations. "(1) The Commission recommends that comparable financial information for the entire postsecondary education enterprise be collected and reported in a timely and systematic fashion. (2) The Commission further recommends that financial information associated with institutions of postsecondary education be collected and reported in close cooperation with the state." (p. 130). It might be noted that the Higher Education General Information Survey (HEGIS) was intended, among other things, to do exactly this when it was established in the late 1960s.

Our interest in this study was, besides the central focus on state student aid expenditures, in state direct expenditures for institutional operations. After consideration of the few sources available, we decided to use the annual surveys conducted by M.M. Chambers on state support for higher education as reported by correspondence with "key persons in each state" and published annually in summary reports by the National Association of State Universities and Land-Grant Colleges. Chambers' data include state appropriations for both institutional operating budgets and scholarship/grant programs.

Susan Nelson of the Brookings Institution also recently examined the various sources of institutional aid data and reached the same decision to use the Chambers' data set. Our reasons correspond to hers: "Although the methods and sources used by Chambers are not as reliable as would be desired, his data are probably as good as and are more readily available for more years than the alternative series compiled by Lyman Glenny and Janet Ruyle, by Glenny and James Kidder for the Education Commission of the States, and by the National Center for Education Statistics. (Lyman A. Glenny and Janet Ruyle, *State Tax Support of Higher Education: Revenue Appropriations Trends and Patterns, 1963-1975* [Center for Research and Development in Higher Education, 1975]; Glenny and James R. Kidder, *State Tax Support of Higher Education: Revenue Appropriation Trends and Patterns, 1963-1973*, report 47 [Education Commission of the States, 1974]; and the annual publications of the National Center for Education Statistics, *Digest of Educational Statistics and Financial Statistics of Institutions of Higher Education.*) Chambers and others acknowledge that his figures are most useful and consistent for analysis within a state over time rather than for interstate comparisons." (in Breneman and Finn, 1978, pp. 89-90).

REFERENCES

Boyd, Joseph D., National Association of State Scholarship and Grant Programs Annual Survey. Deerfield, Ill.: National Association of State Scholarship and Grant Programs. Published annually, 1969-1980.

Breneman, David W., and Chester E. Finn, Jr., eds., Public Policy and Private Higher Education. Washington, D.C.: The Brookings Institution, 1978.

Carnegie Council on Policy Studies in Higher Education, Next Steps for the 1980s in Student Financial Aid. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Publishers, 1979.

Carnegie Council on Policy Studies in Higher Education, The States and Private Higher Education. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Publishers, 1977.

Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching, The States and Higher Education: A Proud Past and a Vital Future. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Publishers, 1976.

Chambers, M. M., Appropriations of State Tax Funds for Operating Expenses of Higher Education. Washington, D.C.: National Association of State Universities and Land-Grant Colleges. Published annually.

Education Commission of the States, National Center for Higher Education Management Systems, and State Higher Education Executive Officers Association, State Postsecondary Education Profiles Handbook: 1979 Edition. Denver: Education Commission of the States, 1979.

Fenske, R.H., ed., Renewing and Developing the Partnership: Federal/State/Campus Cooperation in Student Financial Aid. Iowa City, Iowa: American College Testing Program, 1981.

Hansen, Janet S., The State Student Incentive Grant Program: An Assessment of the Record and Options for the Future. New York: College Entrance Examination Board, 1979.

Hauptman, A., and Lois D. Rice, Student Grant Assistance in New York State. New York: College Entrance Examination Board, 1980.

Keene, Roland, Frank C. Adams, and John E. King, Money, Marbles, or Chalk; Student Financial Support in Higher Education. Carbondale, Ill.: Southern Illinois University Press, 1975.

Mathews, John, "The States Move in on Student Aid," Compact, Vol. 8, No. 3, (1974), pp. 23-26.

McCoy, Marilyn, State and Local Financial Support of Higher Education: A Framework for Interstate Comparisons, 1973-1974 (Field Review Edition). Boulder, Colo.: National Center for Higher Education Management Systems, 1976.

McCoy, Marilyn, and D. Kent Halstead, Higher Education Financing in the 50 States: Interstate Comparisons, Fiscal Year 1976 (Review Edition). Washington, D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1979.

National Commission on the Financing of Postsecondary Education, Financing Postsecondary Education in the United States, Washington, D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1973.

Nelson, Susan C., "Financial Trends and Issues" in Public Policy and Private Higher Education, David W. Breneman and Chester E. Finn, Jr., eds. Washington, D.C.: The Brookings Institution, 1978.

Smith, Mark K., Profiles of State Student Financial Aid Programs. Denver: Education Commission of States (Also National Center for Higher Education Management Systems), 1978.

Van Dusen, William D., The Coming Crisis in Student Aid. New York: Aspen Institute for Humanistic Studies, 1979.

APPENDIX

TABLE A: Number of Awards and Dollars Appropriated* by States, 1969–70 Through 1980–81, as Reported in Each Annual NASSGP Survey (Number of Awards Shown in Parentheses)

State	1969–70	1970–71	1971–72	1972–73	1973–74	1974–75
Alabama						
Alaska						
Arizona						
Arkansas						
California	(14,683) $11,865,143	(18,035) $15,531,750	(23,899) $18,834,525	(32,094) $24,700,642	(39,040) $31,338,543	(47,320) $41,057,114
Colorado				(12,066) $5,127,890	(13,056) $5,875,104	(12,805) $7,042,800
Connecticut	(1,519) $906,675	(2,346) $1,570,550	(1,990) $1,329,587	(2,984) $1,705,900	(2,953) $1,763,900	(4,721) $2,666,500
Delaware				(112) $73,210	(117) $72,650	(125) $75,000
District of Columbia						
Florida		(2,200) $1,520,000	(800) $600,000	(337) $360,000	(3,151) $3,537,400	(4,448) $4,864,055
Georgia						(3,800) $1,186,116
Hawaii						
Idaho						(46) $35,000
Illinois	(38,270) $26,058,608	(48,166) $33,102,799	(58,011) $39,400,000	(69,588) $51,091,125	(72,246) $53,767,000	(90,000) $63,220,000
Indiana	(6,550) $3,080,000	(7,214) $3,140,000	(10,297) $7,357,280	(11,970) $8,255,281	(13,347) $9,095,404	(15,278) $11,800,000
Iowa	(2,705) $1,762,500	(4,082) $3,262,500	(4,738) $4,290,000	(4,932) $4,231,977	(7,207) $6,214,670	(7,759) $6,572,591
Kansas	(409) $150,000	(300) $150,000	(324) $150,000	(1,427) $1,145,992	(3,008) $2,476,586	(3,453) $2,883,500
Kentucky						(1,614) $554,500
Louisiana						
Maine				(237) $147,522	(328) $183,217	(420) $383,660
Maryland	(7,250) $2,900,000	(6,512) $2,750,000	(9,500) $3,211,000	(650) $296,500	(545) $327,300	(632) $320,500
Massachusetts	(3,000) $2,000,000	(6,500) $3,500,000	(14,000) $8,000,000	(13,000) $8,000,000	(15,849) $9,498,350	(18,400) $11,198,000
Michigan	(24,030) $12,500,000	(22,758) $12,857,000	(23,500) $13,268,000	(23,501) $13,598,058	(21,656) $16,578,425	(22,430) $18,567,928
Minnesota	(1,293) $775,000	(2,460) $1,475,000	(3,890) $2,630,000	(7,012) $4,660,022	(8,705) $5,699,856	(6,707) $8,526,365
Mississippi						

* The dollar amounts given are the amounts appropriated by states for the indicated year. Such amounts often, but not always, correspond to the dollars actually spent for awards. In most instances, final figures for dollars actually spent in a given year are indicated in the survey for the subsequent year.

** Slightly different reporting criteria were used in 1980-81 than in the previous 11 surveys. For example, North Carolina and Virginia included non-need-based awards for the first time. Please also note that the number of awards for Wyoming, as given in the NASSGP report, is probably incorrect.

State	1975–76	1976–77	1977–78	1978–79	1979–80	1980–81**
Alabama	(3,496)	(2,350)	(2,453)	(7,238)	(8,225)	(4,039)
	$524,000	$423,000	$546,000	$2,171,000	$2,468,000	$1,212,000
Alaska			(90)	(95)	(160)	(160)
			$141,000	$150,000	$240,000	$240,000
Arizona			(1,958)	(2,200)	(2,650)	(2,473)
			$1,201,000	$1,500,000	$1,800,000	$1,793,000
Arkansas	(1,144)	(1,095)	(2,289)	(3,200)	(4,000)	(8,747)
	$203,000	$487,000	$500,000	$747,000	$1,104,000	$2,374,000
California	(50,723)	(60,155)	(57,533)	(59,954)	(65,375)	(61,370)
	$51,073,000	$62,700,000	$78,391,000	$83,573,000	$83,478,000	$89,882,000
Colorado	(12,200)	(12,200)	(13,500)	(14,400)	(10,500)	(17,200)
	$7,531,000	$9,019,000	$9,771,000	$9,956,000	$8,060,000	$6,432,000
Connecticut	(7,608)	(8,493)	(9,999)	(11,980)	(10,550)	(7,928)
	$5,062,000	$5,799,000	$6,801,000	$7,910,000	$8,619,000	$7,241,000
Delaware	(300)	(300)	(794)	(775)	(1,600)	(763)
	$200,000	$350,000	$540,000	$541,000	$550,000	$481,000
District of Columbia		(650)	(794)	(650)	(895)	(943)
		$688,000	$873,000	$873,000	$1,073,000	$1,111,000
Florida	(4,389)	(6,141)	(7,802)	(9,572)	(12,000)	(14,309)
	$4,599,000	$7,308,000	$8,290,000	$9,151,000	$10,400,000	$11,549,000
Georgia	(4,243)	(6,153)	(8,000)	(11,000)	(13,500)	(14,735)
	$1,168,000	$1,943,000	$2,807,000	$3,175,000	$3,365,000	$4,321,000
Hawaii	(784)	(800)	(2,962)	(4,800)	(2,700)	(2,000)
	$88,000	$362,000	$298,000	$496,000	$452,000	$623,000
Idaho	(175)	(1,569)	(686)	(800)	(930)	(803)
	$101,000	$394,000	$360,000	$412,000	$494,000	$513,000
Illinois	(92,003)	(90,978)	(92,291)	(97,725)	(76,296)	(85,758)
	$68,200,000	$69,370,000	$74,150,000	$84,275,000	$74,497,000	$85,758,000
Indiana	(20,666)	(25,538)	(26,610)	(27,520)	(27,965)	(34,510)
	$15,375,000	$19,159,000	$19,650,000	$21,100,000	$21,479,000	$23,471,000
Iowa	(9,248)	(9,616)	(11,877)	(12,800)	(13,385)	(14,343)
	$9,618,000	$10,476,000	$11,525,000	$13,541,000	$15,302,000	$16,400,000
Kansas	(4,138)	(4,915)	(5,616)	(5,370)	(6,153)	(6,516)
	$3,420,000	$4,030,000	$4,435,000	$4,415,000	$4,650,000	$5,025,000
Kentucky	(6,235)	(8,104)	(11,048)	(12,050)	(13,612)	(14,700)
	$2,165,000	$2,622,000	$3,838,000	$4,659,000	$5,309,000	$6,600,000
Louisiana	(1,414)	(1,500)	(1,588)	(1,600)	(2,100)	(1,954)
	$4,650,000	$559,000	$595,000	$600,000	$872,000	$823,000
Maine	(949)	(925)	(1,562)	(1,740)	(1,800)	(5,000)
	$475,000	$625,000	$531,000	$1,091,000	$1,350,000	$1,236,000
Maryland	(2,061)	(2,500)	(10,378)	(11,200)	(12,300)	(12,467)
	$1,340,000	$1,801,000	$4,489,000	$5,000,000	$5,554,000	$5,799,000
Massachusetts	(20,831)	(22,542)	(24,477)	(26,850)	(26,597)	(28,250)
	$12,359,000	$13,180,000	$14,599,000	$15,557,000	$16,249,000	$16,515,000
Michigan	(25,455)	(28,085)	(30,668)	(30,700)	(32,689)	(33,887)
	$20,440,000	$25,389,000	$27,699,000	$28,712,000	$30,192,000	$31,782,000
Minnesota	(13,425)	(21,104)	(25,493)	(30,214)	(30,488)	(42,700)
	$12,002,000	$18,400,000	$17,892,000	$26,827,000	$23,631,000	$31,600,000
Mississippi	(680)	(1,422)	(1,923)	(2,200)	(2,200)	(1,800)
	$340,000	$711,000	$1,064,000	$1,109,000	$1,109,000	$2,516,000

TABLE A: Number of Awards and Dollars Appropriated* by States, 1969–70 Through 1980–81, as Reported in Each Annual NASSGP Survey (Number of Awards Shown in Parentheses)

State	1969–70	1970–71	1971–72	1972–73	1973–74	1974–75
Missouri				(172) $56,172	(7,489) $3,299,006	(7,651) $3,874,786
Montana						
Nebraska						(337) $286,332
Nevada						
New Hampshire						
New Jersey	(26,658) $11,850,000	(31,700) $18,836,000	(35,715) $21,972,621	(37,942) $22,546,357	(48,477) $25,357,431	(48,508) $27,579,250
New Mexico						
New York	(245,038) $67,745,320	(253,000) $70,300,000	(299,700) $76,250,000	(270,855) $73,912,387	(273,100) $78,000,000	(269,000) $108,450,000
North Carolina						
North Dakota					(625) $144,708	(731) $255,500
Ohio		(15,000) $8,500,000	(25,000) $15,000,000	(36,561) $15,594,988	(40,682) $16,700,000	(40,000) $17,540,000
Oklahoma						(2,000) $540,000
Oregon	(6,961) $815,400	(4,140) $530,000	(2,625) $1,055,000	(3,514) $1,293,812	(4,218) $1,823,326	(5,389) $2,333,853
Pennsylvania	(77,400) $51,400,000	(85,000) $51,400,000	(93,000) $55,458,000	(105,501) $62,759,544	(106,474) $63,639,614	(107,871) $73,191,262
Rhode Island	(2,000) $1,500,000	(2,423) $1,475,700	(2,489) $1,861,000	(2,429) $1,914,825	(2,490) $1,933,525	(2,528) $1,983,650
South Carolina				(129) $147,500	(3,284) $3,849,600	(4,892) $6,080,000
South Dakota						(576) $212,620
Tennessee				(2,002) $1,177,093	(3,888) $2,146,628	(5,808) $3,618,205
Texas			(2,000) $1,000,000	(6,550) $3,000,000	(10,002) $5,000,000	(15,000) $7,500,000
Utah						
Vermont	(2,100) $1,099,255	(3,150) $1,310,000	(3,800) $2,400,000	(3,422) $2,380,343	(3,972) $2,525,126	(4,050) $2,804,000
Virginia					(195) $53,686	(2,000) $800,000
Washington	(838) $390,000	(10,725) $1,445,869	(10,725) $1,445,869	(1,600) $887,193	(4,422) $1,400,000	(7,711) $3,195,972
West Virginia	(625) $175,000	(800) $250,000	(1,000) $300,000	(1,363) $425,000	(1,649) $500,000	(3,800) $1,500,000
Wisconsin	(9,510) $2,950,000	(8,650) $3,363,000	(8,500) $3,526,000	(9,396) $5,689,043	(20,720) $11,085,734	(23,135) $13,668,500
Wyoming						
American Samoa						

State	1975–76	1976–77	1977–78	1978–79	1979–80	1980–81**
Missouri	(10,025)	(9,200)	(15,750)	(26,000)	(28,000)	(13,400)
	$3,802,000	$4,197,000	$6,330,000	$8,765,000	$9,000,000	$10,043,000
Montana		(400)	(1,320)	(1,200)	(1,373)	(1,200)
		$115,000	$330,000	$351,000	$412,000	$428,000
Nebraska	(1,200)	(1,500)	(1,591)	(1,600)	(1,700)	(2,100)
	$280,000	$600,000	$409,000	$840,000	$856,000	$1,155,000
Nevada			(328)	(500)	(930)	(450)
			$173,000	$400,000	$493,000	$300,000
New Hampshire		(550)	(800)	(1,000)	(1,250)	(1,300)
		$300,000	$372,000	$500,000	$517,000	$550,000
New Jersey	(37,605)	(52,321)	(55,976)	(72,588)	(68,207)	(75,413)
	$21,268,000	$27,906,000	$26,475,000	$36,448,000	$37,979,000	$43,710,000
New Mexico		(500)	(1,450)	(1,500)	(1,500)	(1,500)
		$200,000	$546,000	$600,000	$720,000	$771,000
New York	(316,039)	(424,000)	(422,000)	(422,000)	(426,340)	(397,000)
	$129,000,000	$197,300,000	$241,400,000	$264,300,000	$274,500,000	$269,200,000
North Carolina	(1,099)	(2,475)	(4,457)	(5,100)	(5,800)	(30,587)
	$846,000	$1,606,000	$2,570,000	$2,741,000	$3,299,000	$16,524,000
North Dakota	(822)	(900)	(1,037)	(1,050)	(1,450)	(1,460)
	$234,000	$297,000	$339,000	$343,000	$543,000	$606,000
Ohio	(47,124)	(54,000)	(52,814)	(55,476)	(66,000)	(60,800)
	$19,896,000	$26,342,000	$23,638,000	$25,925,000	$30,916,000	$31,490,000
Oklahoma	(2,197)	(5,000)	(7,663)	(8,214)	(10,205)	(10,205)
	$532,000	$1,196,000	$1,672,000	$1,873,000	$2,265,000	$2,265,000
Oregon	(6,251)	(6,124)	(9,847)	(13,938)	(12,614)	(16,546)
	$2,809,000	$2,912,000	$3,853,000	$6,366,000	$5,707,000	$6,691,000
Pennsylvania	(118,070)	(115,900)	(118,636)	(120,000)	(125,000)	(129,020)
	$67,942,000	$70,360,000	$72,308,000	$75,500,000	$81,100,000	$82,464,000
Rhode Island	(2,992)	(2,915)	(5,864)	(3,777)	(5,779)	(6,300)
	$2,095,000	$2,388,000	$2,797,000	$3,305,000	$4,218,000	$4,500
South Carolina	(5,783)	(7,800)	(7,758)	(7,900)	(7,650)	(8,200)
	$7,360,000	$7,699,000	$8,907,000	$9,994,000	$10,618,000	$11,700,000
South Dakota	(1,032)	(1,214)	(1,300)	(1,400)	(1,400)	(476)
	$207,000	$243,000	$236,000	$265,000	$420,000	$123,000
Tennessee	(711)	(1,750)	(4,958)	(7,141)	(11,098)	(10,399)
	$640,000	$1,500,000	$2,977,000	$4,250,000	$6,200,000	$6,572,000
Texas	(19,164)	(27,928)	(25,500)	(26,617)	(26,250)	(26,140)
	$8,910,000	$12,803,000	$12,824,000	$15,374,000	$18,449,000	$15,004,000
Utah	(561)	(1,094)	(1,780)	(4,138)	(3,000)	(3,000)
	$343,000	$670,000	$1,247,000	$1,858,000	$1,504,000	$1,504,000
Vermont	(4,689)	(5,420)	(5,438)	(5,600)	(6,150)	(6,930)
	$2,703,000	$2,700,000	$3,199,000	$3,855,000	$4,253,000	$4,900,000
Virginia	(4,424)	(8,000)	(8,897)	(10,164)	(14,000)	(31,500)
	$1,220,000	$1,897,000	$2,486,000	$3,486,000	$3,782,000	$11,176,000
Washington	(7,522)	(7,500)	(10,474)	(10,474)	(9,350)	(10,154)
	$3,884,000	$3,010,000	$4,292,000	$4,609,000	$4,796,000	$5,170,000
West Virginia	(3,498)	(3,730)	(5,051)	(4,950)	(4,850)	(4,800)
	$1,794,000	$1,951,000	$2,690,000	$2,924,000	$3,021,000	$3,023,000
Wisconsin	(27,887)	(34,190)	(35,300)	(39,500)	(39,400)	(49,698)
	$16,146,000	$19,202,000	$21,243,000	$23,085,000	$20,967,000	$23,063,000
Wyoming	(64)	(80)	(95)	(430)	(500)	(42)
	$21,000	$64,000	$56,000	$195,000	$251,000	$261,000
American Samoa	(100)	(105)	(149)	(177)	(180)	(119)
	$240,000	$253,000	$293,000	$297,000	$300,000	$615,000

TABLE A: Number of Awards and Dollars Appropriated* by States, 1969–70 Through 1980–81, as Reported in Each Annual NASSGP Survey (Number of Awards Shown in Parentheses)

State	1969–70	1970–71	1971–72	1972–73	1973–74	1974–75
Guam						
Northern Marianas						
Puerto Rico						(220) $163,421
Trust Territory						(1) $783
Virgin Islands				(308) $284,100	(372) $317,635	(352) $400,952
Totals	(470,839) $199,933,901	(535,161) $236,280,168	(635,503) $279,338,882	(661,654) $315,462,476	(733,267) $364,204,424	(797,153) $456,932,535

TABLE B: Comparison of State Expenditures for Total State Higher Education Operations and Student Financial Aid, 1969–70 Through 1980–81
(Dollar Amounts Shown in Thousands [add 000], Student Aid Amounts Underlined, Ratios of Total Operations to Student Aid Expenditures Shown in Parentheses.)

State	1969–70	1970–71	1971–72	1972–73	1973–74	1974–75
Alabama	72,519	74,825	106,807	113,457	151,836	192,988
Alaska	11,876	17,000	19,500	21,978	23,399	36,073
Arizona	65,611	83,351	97,514	112,712	135,998	152,549
Arkansas	47,630	54,922	52,177	56,371	73,411	82,421
California	749,162 11,865 (1.58)	817,126 15,532 (1.90)	853,623 19,055 (2.23)	1,009,272 26,708 (2.65)	1,156,254 31,339 (2.71)	1,365,861 38,909 (2.85)
Colorado	87,094	110,624	113,463	117,509	140,315 5,875 (4.19)	167,154 6,712 (4.02)
Connecticut	79,392 907 (1.14)	97,353 1,571 (1.61)	111,695 1,326 (1.19)	113,724 1,706 (1.50)	119,918 1,764 (1.47)	135,247 5,229 (3.87)
Delaware	16,993	20,230	23,091	25,887	33,573 073 (.22)	37,206 81 (.22)
Florida	198,438	241,356 1,520 (.63)	247,540 600 (.24)	302,112 713 (.24)	346,056 3,537 (1.02)	412,299 4,300 (1.04)
Georgia	124,207	148,652	162,953	177,819	218,660	237,416 351 (.15)

State	1975–76	1976–77	1977–78	1978–79	1979–80	1980–81**
Guam	(69)	(15)	(56)	(56)	(60)	(60)
	$309,000	$57,000	$231,000	$231,000	$235,000	$235,000
Northern Marianas				(350)	(360)	(360)
				$496,000	$500,000	$500,000
Puerto Rico		(2,200)	(1,550)	(1,600)	(1,940)	(1,940)
		$720,000	$1,092,000	$1,160,000	$1,458,000	$1,458,000
Trust Territory	(433)	(1,000)	(718)	(1,000)	(1,000)	(1,000)
	$496,000	$591,000	$560,000	$505,000	$505,000	$505,000
Virgin Islands	(413)	(381)	(378)	(393)	(355)	(355)
	$421,000	$439,000	$473,000	$501,000	$214,000	$214,000
Totals	(901,941)	(1,095,327)	(1,161,376)	(1,242,361)	(1,262,361)	(1,319,809)
	$510,206,000	$645,383,000	$737,004,000	$828,883,000	$852,295,000	$912,017,000

State	1975–76	1976–77	1977–78	1978–79	1979–80	1980–81
Alabama	272,819	268,919	310,974	374,332	377,135	427,499
	262	235	273	1,085	1,364	1,212
	(.10)	(.09)	(.09)	(.29)	(.36)	(.28)
Alaska	52,884	64,829	64,013	71,742	72,492	81,884
		36	71	75	120	120
		(.06)	(.11)	(.10)	(.17)	(.15)
Arizona	162,657	184,786	207,961	218,166	232,707	280,446
		385	601	798	900	897
		(.21)	(.29)	(.37)	(.39)	(.32)
Arkansas	103,202	114,936	126,135	140,319	169,664	187,567
	102	123	250	374	638	1,868
	(.10)	(.11)	(.20)	(.27)	(.38)	(1.00)
California	1,541,528	1,827,549	1,961,525	2,333,110	2,814,321	3,158,885
	47,935	61,485	68,757	67,677	71,387	77,482
	(3.11)	(3.36)	(3.51)	(2.90)	(2.54)	(2.45)
Colorado	184,313	206,226	220,907	237,310	246,866	263,984
	7,236	7,873	8,985	8,639	7,045	5,389
	(3.93)	(3.82)	(4.07)	(3.64)	(2.85)	(2.04)
Connecticut	136,623	145,888	190,757	206,901	212,075	250,357
	4,763	5,103	6,038	6,844	7,652	6,198
	(3.49)	(3.50)	(3.17)	(3.31)	(3.61)	(2.48)
Delaware	41,966	43,311	44,190	48,831	53,273	63,811
	140	467	379	341	350	241
	(.33)	(1.08)	(.86)	(.70)	(.66)	(.38)
Florida	410,952	434,857	489,609	535,809	610,094	705,409
	4,00?	5,616	6,500	7,257	8,163	9,000
	(.97)	(1.29)	(1.33)	(1.35)	(1.34)	(1.28)
Georgia	240,490	265,562	302,907	346,731	385,132	431,963
	846	1,072	1,745	2,064	2,015	2,985
	(.35)	(.40)	(.58)	(.60)	(.52)	(.69)

TABLE B: Comparison of State Expenditures for Total State Higher Education Operations and Student Financial Aid, 1969–70 Through 1980–81
(Dollar Amounts Shown in Thousands [add 000], Student Aid Amounts Underlined, Ratios of Total Operations to Student Aid Expenditures Shown in Parentheses.)

State	1969–70	1970–71	1971–72	1972–73	1973–74	1974–75
Hawaii	41,782	55,167	59,866	64,478	57,295	70,742
Idaho	29,802	31,506	34,167	36,785	40,566	50,238
Illinois	405,077	475,533	475,179	516,726	550,904	623,949
	26,059	33,103	39,400	51,200	53,767	57,348
	(6.43)	(6.96)	(8.29)	(9.91)	(9.76)	(9.19)
Indiana	154,313	173,979	201,345	210,595	233,379	247,119
	3,080	3,140	9,357	8,255	9,095	11,078
	(2.00)	(1.80)	(3.65)	(3.92)	(3.90)	(4.48)
Iowa	101,597	108,062	119,881	125,505	144,476	165,226
	1,763	3,263	4,290	4,233	6,215	6,344
	(1.74)	(3.02)	(3.58)	(3.37)	(4.30)	(3.84)
Kansas	79,871	82,181	84,456	93,087	108,927	126,502
	150	150	143	1,146	2,477	2,668
	(.19)	(.18)	(.17)	(1.23)	(2.27)	(2.11)
Kentucky	95,478	108,715	120,489	139,485	148,214	153,760
						320
						(.21)
Louisiana	99,352	121,813	139,916	146,664	158,855	185,531
Maine	26,045	27,783	30,741	33,612	39,828	43,912
				150	183	309
				(.45)	(.46)	(.70)
Maryland	92,132	120,961	141,913	159,156	172,826	208,960
	2,900	2,750	3,007	3,425	327	936
	(3.15)	(2.27)	(2.12)	(2.15)	(.19)	(.45)
Massachusetts	85,278	116,093	130,212	154,451	176,707	199,761
	2,000	3,500	8,000	7,949	9,498	10,732
	(2.35)	(3.01)	(6.14)	(5.15)	(5.37)	(5.37)
Michigan	305,411	343,691	379,409	417,815	464,029	524,173
	12,500	12,867	13,065	13,555	16,578	18,390
	(4.09)	(3.74)	(3.44)	(3.24)	(3.57)	(3.51)
Minnesota	128,278	143,448	164,566	174,040	187,552	245,757
	775	1,475	2,630	4,656	5,700	7,814
	(.60)	(1.03)	(1.60)	(2.68)	(3.04)	(3.18)
Mississippi	47,804	72,189	84,112	97,100	112,868	130,729
Missouri	127,497	131,571	149,102	161,464	180,719	197,911
					3,299	3,466
					(1.83)	(1.75)
Montana	26,715	29,156	30,635	30,798	36,792	35,559
Nebraska	48,386	48,386	51,915	56,780	68,000	85,400
						139
						(.16)

State	1975–76	1976–77	1977–78	1978–79	1979–80	1980–81
Hawaii	95,231	97,884	109,642	113,767	119,073	135,373
	44	93	149	248	226	312
	(.05)	(.10)	(.14)	(.22)	(.19)	(.23)
Idaho	61,558	69,197	75,279	83,797	83,608	94,146
	65	176	180	205	247	257
	(.11)	(.25)	(.24)	(.24)	(.30)	(.27)
Illinois	641,623	685,414	740,190	815,782	876,951	964,584
	67,089	67,279	71,186	76,440	75,000	81,658
	(10.46)	(9.82)	(9.62)	(9.37)	(8.55)	(8.46)
Indiana	295,297	329,971	352,406	384,376	411,198	459,639
	14,915	17,198	18,509	19,834	19,960	21,955
	(5.05)	(5.22)	(5.25)	(5.16)	(4.85)	(4.78)
Iowa	196,070	225,388	245,552	272,725	303,631	332,244
	9,368	9,612	10,902	12,864	14,500	15,451
	(4.78)	(4.26)	(4.44)	(4.72)	(4.78)	(4.68)
Kansas	153,078	173,777	188,869	222,216	238,839	259,859
	3,174	3,423	3,785	3,709	3,800	4,161
	(2.07)	(1.97)	(2.00)	(1.67)	(1.59)	(1.60)
Kentucky	169,691	205,861	227,090	272,909	299,918	307,572
	1,918	1,901	3,124	3,522	4,361	5,659
	(1.13)	(.92)	(1.38)	(1.29)	(1.45)	(1.84)
Louisiana	198,996	214,998	242,469	278,954	330,008	398,325
	233	279	298	321	436	412
	(.12)	(.13)	(.12)	(.12)	(.13)	(.10)
Maine	44,818	42,567	45,911	48,966	57,265	62,628
	396	314	313	862	1,074	955
	(.88)	(.74)	(.68)	(1.76)	(1.88)	(1.52)
Maryland	207,451	256,777	271,938	292,755	323,732	367,701
	957	865	3,454	3,852	4,188	4,400
	(.46)	(.34)	(1.27)	(1.32)	(1.29)	(1.20)
Massachusetts	217,238	246,316	251,742	273,333	314,929	322,498
	11,624	11,854	12,564	13,300	13,765	13,949
	(5.35)	(4.89)	(4.99)	(4.87)	(4.37)	(4.32)
Michigan	556,806	593,930	660,404	733,978	808,320	816,400
	19,512	22,886	25,147	26,223	27,059	28,582
	(3.50)	(3.85)	(3.81)	(3.57)	(3.35)	(3.50)
Minnesota	316,674	324,035	380,995	393,359	460,783	447,954
	11,641	15,920	16,793	21,270	22,199	30,144
	(3.68)	(4.91)	(4.41)	(5.41)	(4.82)	(6.31)
Mississippi	149,363	154,036	186,579	218,950	233,738	261,282
	170	356	542	532	555	1,887
	(.11)	(.23)	(.29)	(.24)	(.24)	(.72)
Missouri	213,774	236,782	259,359	284,836	312,941	353,252
	3,371	3,259	5,157	5,560	7,489	8,563
	(1.58)	(1.38)	(1.99)	(1.95)	(2.39)	(2.42)
Montana	44,665	47,099	52,251	55,050	60,494	66,503
		38	165	176	206	214
		(.08)	(.32)	(.32)	(.34)	(.32)
Nebraska	100,082	121,980	131,199	140,539	150,940	166,155
	140	143	205	428	428	578
	(.14)	(.12)	(.16)	(.30)	(.28)	(.34)

TABLE B: Comparison of State Expenditures for Total State Higher Education Operations and Student Financial Aid, 1969–70 Through 1980–81
(Dollar Amounts Shown in Thousands [add 000], Student Aid Amounts Underlined, Ratios of Total Operations to Student Aid Expenditures Shown in Parentheses.)

State	1969–70	1970–71	1971–72	1972–73	1973–74	1974–75
Nevada	14,778	15,908	18,642	20,656	26,632	29,720
New Hampshire	10,685	10,938	12,419	13,761	17,403	19,106
New Jersey	126,250	154,430	184,679	236,280	257,708	289,512
	11,850	18,836	20,871	23,222	25,357	24,015
	(9.39)	(12.20)	(11.30)	(9.83)	(9.84)	(8.29)
New Mexico	36,126	41,639	45,307	50,968	54,902	61,382
New York	625,341	746,529	803,913	822,425	983,941	1,159,800
	67,745	70,300	71,500	75,000	78,000	95,088
	(10.83)	(9.42)	(8.89)	(9.12)	(7.93)	(8.20)
North Carolina	175,931	175,931	223,486	223,486	287,115	349,272
North Dakota	23,249	23,249	26,998	27,476	31,730	31,730
						183
						(.58)
Ohio	239,891	260,690	285,677	304,405	345,759	386,017
		8,500	15,000	16,000	16,700	18,118
		(3.26)	(5.25)	(5.26)	(4.83)	(4.69)
Oklahoma	59,552	69,467	79,311	81,720	96,038	105,970
						246
						(.23)
Oregon	87,683	96,578	103,000	106,990	123,479	129,889
	815	530	820	1,296	1,823	1,730
	(.93)	(.55)	(.80)	(1.21)	(1.48)	(1.33)
Pennsylvania	317,305	309,521	347,483	396,476	500,684	573,631
	51,400	51,400	57,500	58,832	63,640	70,284
	(16.20)	(16.61)	(16.55)	(14.84)	(12.71)	(12.25)
Rhode Island	28,935	31,413	30,443	35,344	42,439	47,036
	1,500	1,476	1,710	539	1,934	1,933
	(5.18)	(4.70)	(5.62)	(1.53)	(4.56)	(4.11)
South Carolina	70,342	77,446	84,278	104,980	145,402	185,958
				150	3,805	6,088
				(.14)	(2.65)	(3.27)
South Dakota	18,227	21,202	21,844	21,736	25,977	32,221
						168
						(.52)
Tennessee	87,137	98,598	114,034	128,175	147,253	174,259
				1,171	2,147	3,051
				(.91)	(1.46)	(1.75)
Texas	340,046	343,515	418,369	463,528	509,130	533,583
			1,000	3,000	5,000	7,102
			(.24)	(.65)	(.98)	(1.33)
Utah	40,000	45,320	50,422	57,195	66,373	75,740
						84
						(.11)

State	1975–76	1976–77	1977–78	1978–79	1979–80	1980–81
Nevada	37,719	42,357	45,457	50,112	56,896	62,107
			87	86	247	150
			(.19)	(.17)	(.43)	(.24)
New Hampshire	22,432	22,859	27,519	27,542	29,806	32,919
		135	186	225	259	275
		(.59)	(1.68)	(1.82)	(.87)	(.83)
New Jersey	267,337	274,405	340,645	370,637	400,366	434,222
	20,719	24,487	24,933	34,626	36,023	41,626
	(7.75)	(8.92)	(7.32)	(9.34)	(9.00)	(9.59)
New Mexico	74,226	82,047	95,756	114,458	125,731	143,316
		100	273	267	360	386
		(.12)	(.29)	(.23)	(.29)	(.27)
New York	,256,593	1,251,096	1,298,754	1,421,407	1,543,416	1,644,361
	127,059	206,530	235,494	247,842	267,275	262,600
	(10.11)	(16.51)	(18.13)	(17.44)	(17.32)	(15.97)
North Carolina	368,754	407,977	460,932	521,863	580,189	660,645
	423	786	1,285	1,367	1,650	14,804
	(.11)	(.19)	(.28)	(.26)	(.28)	(2.24)
North Dakota	48,865	48,865	61,240	61,240	75,660	75,660
	166	140	170	170	341	303
	(.34)	(.29)	(.28)	(.28)	(.45)	(.40)
Ohio	451,566	502,225	551,174	604,651	669,197	719,90[illegible]
	19,005	23,040	21,142	23,592	27,953	28,490
	(4.57)	(4.59)	(3.84)	(3.90)	(4.18)	(3.96)
Oklahoma	127,656	152,263	173,261	196,595	228,827	271,180
	266	628	836	923	1,133	1,234
	(.21)	(.41)	(.48)	(.47)	(.50)	(.46)
Oregon	159,328	176,653	198,234	204,000	249,556	250,443
	2,528	2,260	3,111	5,602	4,740	5,726
	(1.59)	(1.28)	(1.57)	(2.75)	(1.90)	(2.29)
Pennsylvania	620,862	659,781	668,172	699,128	738,686	742,051
	67,016	63,013	69,812	68,919	77,848	79,164
	(10.79)	(9.55)	(10.45)	(9.86)	(10.54)	(10.67)
Rhode Island	49,251	56,360	58,743	66,341	71,412	78,321
	1,981	2,137	2,471	2,975	3,827	4,080
	(4.02)	(3.79)	(4.14)	(4.48)	(5.36)	(5.21)
South Carolina	205,483	210,239	227,148	265,076	299,206	344,492
	7,146	7,245	8,176	9,052	9,745	10,834
	(3.48)	(3.45)	(3.60)	(3.41)	(3.26)	(3.14)
South Dakota	35,728	38,382	41,093	45,509	49,872	51,194
	141	122	118	133	210	62
	(.39)	(.32)	(.29)	(.29)	(.42)	(.12)
Tennessee	176,001	211,163	244,646	280,469	318,173	338,165
	320	724	2,018	2,788	4,958	5,272
	(.18)	(.34)	(.82)	(.99)	(1.56)	(1.56)
Texas	830,320	918,589	1,050,400	1,042,243	1,315,526	1,464,881
	7,857	10,011	9,640	8,539	14,346	10,689
	(.95)	(1.09)	(.92)	(.82)	(1.09)	(.73)
Utah	87,848	103,937	117,146	132,047	145,384	160,856
	172	335	808	1,394	946	926
	(.20)	(.33)	(.69)	(1.06)	(.65)	(.58)

TABLE B: Comparison of State Expenditures for Total State Higher Education Operations and Student Financial Aid, 1969–70 Through 1980–81
(Dollar Amounts Shown in Thousands [add 000], Student Aid Amounts Underlined, Ratios of Total Operations to Student Aid Expenditures Shown in Parentheses.)

State	1969–70	1970–71	1971–72	1972–73	1973–74	1974–75
Vermont	13,532	14,758	15,856	16,743	18,453	20,120
	1,099	1,310	2,395	2,380	2,525	2,699
	(8.12)	(8.88)	(15.10)	(14.21)	(13.68)	(13.41)
Virginia	117,578	136,134	153,433	185,572	206,458	242,359
					054	366
					(.03)	(.15)
Washington	191,293	192,349	110,907	190,467	252,224	252,224
	390	1,446	1,440	884	1,440	2,777
	(.20)	(.75)	(1.30)	(.46)	(.56)	(1.10)
West Virginia	55,180	58,969	69,688	77,922	81,796	89,034
	175	250	300	425	500	1,505
	(.32)	(.42)	(.43)	(.55)	(.61)	(1.69)
Wisconsin	168,801	184,600	229,905	257,243	304,546	325,078
	2,950	3.363	3,502	4,922	11,086	12,459
	(1.75)	(1.82)	(1.52)	(1.91)	(3.64)	(3.83)
Wyoming	14,672	14,672	18,316	18,316	23,532	24,306
All States	6,210,214	6,979,529	7,634,677	8,512,246	9,830,328	11,252,470
	199,923	236,282	274,911	312,271	363,888	423,022
	(3.22)	(3.39)	(3.60)	(3.67)	(3.70)	(3.76)
All States With Programs	3,794,831	4,769,620	5,509,739	6,473,051	8,006,462	9,831,854
	199,923	236,282	274,911	312,271	363,888	423,022
	(5.27)	(4.95)	(4.99)	(4.82)	(4.54)	(4.30)

TABLE C: Index of Effort: State Student Aid Award Dollars per State Population, 1970–71 Through 1979–80

State	1970–71	1971–72	1972–73	1973–74	1974–75
Alabama					
Alaska					
Arizona					
Arkansas					
California	.77	.96	1.39	1.57	2.06
Colorado				2.66	3.19
Connecticut	.52	.44	.56	.58	.86
Delaware				.13	.14
Florida	.18	.09	.13	.52	.72
Georgia					.26
Hawaii					
Idaho					.05
Illinois	2.92	3.55	4.62	4.84	5.69
Indiana	.60	1.42	1.70	1.75	2.27
Iowa	1.18	1.52	1.50	2.20	2.33
Kansas	.06	.06	.51	1.10	1.28
Kentucky					.17
Louisiana					
Maine				.18	.39
Maryland	.70	.77	.83	.08	.08

State	1975–76	1976–77	1977–78	1978–79	1979–80	1980–81
Vermont	20,138	20,138	22,983	26,478	27,062	30,459
	2,644	2,439	3,054	3,700	4,064	4,711
	(13.13)	(12.11)	(13.29)	(13.97)	(15.02)	(15.47)
Virginia	277,198	316,042	366,586	425,797	444,054	509,731
	817	896	1,253	2,089	2,188	9,488
	(.29)	(.27)	(.34)	(.49)	(.49)	(1.86)
Washington	310,131	310,131	380,250	380,250	467,717	467,717
	3,443	2,005	3,119	2,954	3,140	3,295
	(1.11)	(.65)	(.82)	(.78)	(.67)	(.70)
West Virginia	103,125	123,622	136,191	148,120	158,684	169,819
	1,649	1,991	2,300	2,500	2,495	2,485
	(1.60)	(1.61)	(1.69)	(1.69)	(1.57)	(1.46)
Wisconsin	334,322	364,056	399,410	433,482	468,618	511,067
	15,649	18,187	19,972	21,446	19,372	21,438
	(4.68)	(5.00)	(5.00)	(4.95)	(4.13)	(4.19)
Wyoming	33,821	36,562	42,833	47,043	51,644	70,504
	11	14	28	140	126	131
	(.03)	(.04)	(.07)	(.30)	(.24)	(.19)
All States	12,708,553	13,907,424	15,350,386	16,964,031	19,075,829	20,931,931
	488,918	605,189	676,358	725,829	778,373	832,848
	(3.85)	(4.35)	(4.41)	(4.28)	(4.08)	(3.98)
All States With Programs	12,313,970	13,865,067	15,350,386	16,964,031	19,075,829	20,931,931
	488,918	605,189	676,358	725,829	778,373	832,848
	(3.97)	(4.36)	(4.41)	(4.28)	(4.08)	(3.98)

State	1975–76	1976–77	1977–78	1978–79	1979–80	1980–81
Alabama	.15	.12	.15	.59	.67	.32
Alaska			.35	.37	.58	.60
Arizona			.53	.67	.78	.76
Arkansas	.11	.25	.24	.35	.51	1.09
California	2.56	3.15	3.64	3.88	3.82	4.03
Colorado	3.41	4.09	3.79	3.87	3.07	2.41
Connecticut	1.67	1.91	2.19	2.55	2.77	2.34
Delaware	.36	.64	.93	.93	.95	.83
Florida	.68	1.08	.99	1.10	1.23	1.34
Georgia	.25	.42	.56	.64	.67	.85
Hawaii	.11	.47	.34	.56	.51	.69
Idaho	.14	.55	.43	.49	.58	.58
Illinois	6.14	6.24	6.62	7.53	6.63	7.63
Indiana	2.96	3.69	3.70	3.97	4.01	4.37
Iowa	3.40	3.71	.01	4.71	5.30	5.66
Kansas	1.52	1.79	1.93	1.92	2.00	2 14
Kentucky	.67	.81	1.12	1.36	1.53	1.89
Louisiana	.13	.15	.15	.15	.22	.21
Maine	.48	.63	.50	1.02	1.25	1.13
Maryland	.34	.46	1.09	1.21	.67	1.40

TABLE C: Index of Effort: State Student Aid Award Dollars per State Population, 1970–71 Through 1979–80

State	1970–71	1971–72	1972–73	1973–74	1974–75
Massachusetts	.62	1.41	1.41	1.67	1.97
Michigan	1.40	1.47	1.56	1.87	2.09
Minnesota	.39	.69	1.24	1.50	2.24
Mississippi					
Missouri				.71	.83
Montana					
Nebraska					.19
Nevada					
New Hampshire					
New Jersey	2.42	2.91	3.58	1.50	2.24
New Mexico					
New York	3.67	3.93	4.40	4.29	5.96
North Carolina					
North Dakota				.23	.41
Ohio	.80	1.41	1.50	1.57	1.65
Oklahoma					.21
Oregon	.08	.39	.56	.87	1.12
Pennsylvania	4.36	4.88	5.13	5.40	6.21
Rhode Island	1.73	1.80	2.00	2.04	2.09
South Carolina				1.49	2.35
South Dakota					.32
Tennessee			.31	.55	.92
Texas		.09	.26	.45	.67
Utah					
Vermont	2.95	5.39	5.63	5.68	6.30
Virginia				.01	.17
Washington	.11	.42	.49	.41	.94
West Virginia	.14	.17	.24	.29	.86
Wisconsin	.68	.79	1.04	2.51	3.09
Wyoming					

State	1975–76	1976–77	1977–78	1978–79	1979–80	1980–81
Massachusetts	2.17	2.32	2.52	2.69	2.81	2.86
Michigan	2.30	2.86	3.04	3.15	3.30	3.46
Minnesota	3.15	4.84	4.53	6.78	5.94	7.88
Mississippi	.15	.32	.45	.47	.46	1.05
Missouri	.81	.90	1.32	1.83	1.87	2.07
Montana	.81	.90	.44	.46	.54	.55
Nebraska		.17	.26	.54	.55	.74
Nevada			.28	.65	.77	.45
New Hampshire		.41	.45	.60	.61	.63
New Jersey	2.97	3.89	3.61	4.97	5.18	5.97
New Mexico		.20	.47	.51	.60	.64
New York	7.09	10.84	13.37	14.64	15.31	15.17
North Carolina	.17	.34	.47	.50	.60	2.96
North Dakota	.38	.48	.53	.53	.64	.93
Ohio	1.87	2.47	2.21	2.43	2.89	2.93
Oklahoma	.21	.47	.60	.68	.80	.79
Oregon	1.34	1.39	1.66	2.74	2.39	2.74
Pennsylvania	5.76	5.97	6.13	6.40	6.88	7.02
Rhode Island	2.21	2.51	2.99	3.53	4.50	4.81
South Carolina	2.84	2.97	3.13	3.51	3.69	4.01
South Dakota	.31	.36	.34	.39	.61	.18
Tennessee	.16	.38	.70	1.00	1.44	1.51
Texas	.80	1.14	1.02	1.22	1.44	1.15
Utah	.32	.63	1.01	1.51	1.18	1.15
Vermont	6.08	6.07	6.71	8.08	8.82	10.06
Virginia	.26	.41	.49	.69	.74	2.17
Washington	1.14	.88	1.16	1.25	1.30	1.37
West Virginia	1.03	1.12	1.47	1.60	1.63	1.63
Wisconsin	3.65	4.35	4.61	5.01	4.51	4.93
Wyoming	.06	.19	.14	.50	.62	.62